# ACTES of conference in Religion,

Holden at PARIS, betweene two Papist Doctours of *SORBONE*, and two godlie Ministers of the Church.

Dravven out of French into English, *by Geffraie Fenton.*

*Mon heur viendra.*

¶ Imprinted at London by H. Bynneman, for VVilliam Norton and Humfrie Toye.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW YORK

# ¶TO THE RIGHT VERtuouſe Lady, the Lady Hobbie,

Geffrey Fenton vvisheth long life in Gods holy feare.

*Ne cheefe fruite of reading (Madame) is a confirmation of iudgement, and therefore neceſſarie wee reade good things, to the ende, that with a vertuouſe exerciſe in conuerſation, our conſcience may alſo ſettle, and our ſelues reſte ſupplied with wholeſome inſtructions conducible to a happie ſtate and direction of lyfe. And albeit (with the Philoſophers) all knowledge of it ſelfe is good (as by Hiſtories to diſcerne the pollicies of times and ſeaſons, and out of other Artes and Sciences to draw the nature of elementes, and propertie of naturall things) yet (with S. Paule) by the knowledge of the Scriptures the mā of God is made perfect, and redily prepared for al good workes, the ſame beeing a dignitie far aboue the value of the earth, and a Philoſophie which ſhines (as S. Peter ſayth) like a Candle in a darke place: yea it bringes vs into hope, and hath power euen to ſaue our ſoules. So that if our trauell in other Artes and Sciences yeelde vs benefite in Ciuill and Politike reſpects, the ſtudie of the Scripture implyeth a heauenly fruite, as by the which our ſinnes are qualefied, our ſoules releeued, our faithe aſſured, and laſtly our whole life ledde (as it were by an Angell of purpoſe) to the viſible ſocietie of ſoueraigne felicitie. Wherein by how muche this fruite is precious and certayne, by ſo muche are wee drawen in a*

2. Tim. 3.

2 Pet. Rom. 15. Iames 1.

necessarie consideration to Christianitie, so to trauell in the vse of it, as wee stande not guiltie with the ignorant man in the Gospell, to whom it was sayd, haddest thou not Moyses and the Prophets? as aduising vs thereby not to disguyse our incredulitie with wante of knowledge least Moyses, the Prophets, and the Scriptures also iudge agaynst vs. Luke. 16.

Heare (Madame) if my sufficiencie were as equall to matche with the nature and maiestie of this high cause, as all Christians liue vnder a condition of necessarie duetie, to know and set foorthe the Scriptures, I could adde many authorities to my present purpose, not to vndertake thereby to prepare your conscience, which I doubt not is infallibly settled in a perfecte Methode of Gods true Religion, and much lesse to induce your zeale, which I know is infinite in the best degree secundum scientiam, as the Apostle aduiseth: not to instruct your conuersation, in which is fully fulfilled a full example of all vertues, nor yet to leade your minde to be more spiritually edified, seeing your societie with publike Lectures and Sermons this last winter in London, standes to witnesse your holy desire, the same also stretching (with the Psalme) to suche a vehement thirste after Gods worde, that euen your boarde (which I did often assist) was seldome without the felowship of deepe Deuines and Preachers, to the ende that as your example drew others to seeke God in Sermons abrode, so also your selfe by priuate conference might be throughly resolued in euery doubte touching your Christian opinion, and so be no lesse perfect towards God, than happie in the voyce of the worlde touching your honorable direction of life, which carieth suche generall integritie in all your dealings, that I haue heard it often doubted whether your Reuerend father hath had at any time more comfort in all his transitorie felicities, than in the successe of suche a daughter, by whose vertues his house is raysed into dignitie, and his aged yeres exercised in consolation.

I coulde further enlarge in th' particular effectes of your deepe discretion, as your wise behauiour amongst the French to discharge the high truste of your husbande, when God had called him from you, your deare care to conuey his dead body with honor from that forreyne place, your vnfayned duetie of a wife in his honorable Funerals, your honest conscience to defray his debtes, and indue such

his

his seruants as depended vpon him with competent consideration, your rare pollicie of a mother to establish your children like the sonnes of suche parents, your continuall hospitalitie yelding charitie to the poore: and lastely your great charge to entertayne men of Artes and learned Faculties, by which your house seemes an Vniuersitie of learning. All which, albeit I rather touche slightely, than bring forth with their due commendation, (as eschewing the note of flatterie, although no truth can be disguysed) yet if I should be silent, and all others vnthankefull to the memorie of those doings, time hir selfe would norish them, as beeing publike monumentes which can not be defaced.

Onely it may please your Ladyshippe to lay afore you these firstfruites of my duetie and honest affection, vnder this little argument of Religion, which albeit is not worthy your view by any indener of mine, yet waying with the qualitie of the matter, your disposition to holy things, I hope it will not proue altogither implausible with you, as conteyning a familiar sense in Gods deepe mysteries, with expresse difference betweene the rude sophistrie of the Papistes, and milde simplicitie of the reformed side: Whiche I beseeche you so fauor with your authoritie and name, that by how muche our Christian countreymen (by your good meanes) may frutefully communicate in so necessarie a benefite, euen by so muche also they may bee drawen too glorifie God, and pray communi voce to giue you societie with that holy widdow which S. Luke commendes so much in his Gospell. At London, iiij. July. 1571. Luke. 2.

Your Ladyships readily to commaund
GEFFREY FENTON.

# A Preface conteyning the occasions of the Conference.

Because many desire to bée directly satisfied touching a common brute spredde of the conference appoynted at the Duke of Montpensiers, betwéene two Doctors of Sorbone, and two Ministers of the Church: whereof some settle and yélde to ordinarie reportes, and some beléeue and iudge according to their proper fansies, I haue thought good (aswell to satisfie the one, as to take from the others all occasions of hastie incredulitie,) to draw into writing the whole discourse, as it passed, togither with the cause and first motion of the disputation.

*Sorbone a College of Papists in Paris.*

The Duke of Montpensier, who (as the world knoweth) is zelouse in his Religion, and of great loue to his children, séeing the Duchesse of Buyllon his daughter happely withdrawen from the Romish opinion, to bée henceforwarde a blessed member of Iesus Christe, and that with suche constancie and confirmation in the knowledge and feare of God, zeale, holynesse, with all other holesome vertues, that neither by priuate persuasions, nor other publike meanes, he coulde stoppe the course of Gods grace working in hir, determined at laste to apply a laste remedie, as thinking to allure hir with the learning and eloquence of doctor Vigor, a man of deare reckening with him: wherein for the better satisfaction of the Lady, after he had imparted his intente with the Duke hir husbande, it was agréed that the persuasions should be ministred to hir in the presence of certayne Ministers, as Spina, with other suche as he woulde call vnto him: with libertie to alleage what they coulde against the doctrine of Vigor, vnder this condition, that if after the Conference they were not confuted and wholly vanquished by him, his daughter shoulde remayne quiet in hir opinion, without further attempts to draw hir from it. Hereunto the Duke of Buyllon did not vnwillingly condiscende, and for a better proofe of his readinesse in the cause, he imparted the whole

whole businesse with the Admirall, by whose aduise with others (assisting the proceeding) Spina was immediatly sente for, who at his comming tolde the Lordes that (the qualitie and humor of his aduersarie considered) he hoped for no great frute in this conference, as being far more parciall for the Pope and his traditions, than of any zeale at all to the word and truth of Jesus Christ: which albeit was affirmed by all the assistants, yet it was agreed that he should vndertake the conference, & that for two considerations, the one to instruct and strengthen the good duchesse agaynst the sophistries & cauillations of Vigor: the other to take from him al occasions to brag (as he is wont to do) that the Ministers durst not appeare before him. Here the order & methode to procede in this businesse, was agreed vpon, with licence to Spyna to require the authoritie and sufferance of the King, that (to auoyde confusion) it might passe in a small presence: that a certayne Theame and subiecte might be proponed to conferre vpon: And lastely, that there might be established two Moderators for all the Actes, and two others deputed to gather faithfully all the Reasons and arguments of either parte.

All whiche orders being orderly communicated to the Duke of Buyllon, by the L. Admirall and Spina, he iudged them of suche reason as not to be denied, warning Spina to prepare him selfe agaynst the firste of July, when the conference should begin in the after noone. Spina intreated Monsieur Barbasta, minister to the quéene of *Nauar* to accompanie him in this disputation, who at the day and houre aforesayde, conducted by three Gentlemen appoynted by the duke of Buyllon, went to the L. of Montpensiers house, where the duke of Buyllon (aduertised belike of their comming) metts thē in the hal: and there (induced as it séemed by the doctors who were in the chamber frō whence he came) asked Spina if (afore ẏ beginning of the conference) he were determined to make his prayers, according to the custom of the reformed churches: He answered yea, and that neither he nor his companion, either might, or ought to set vpon a matter of suche importance, as to treate vpon the mysteries of Christian religion,

ligion, afore they prepared them selues therunto by inuocation to the name of God. With which answere he returned eftsones into the Chamber of the Doctors, who after some priuate counsell amongest them selues, appoynted Doctor Ruze to tell them, that for their parts they would not assiste their prayers, and that there was no more reason for them to be present when they prayed, than for the ministers to forbeare their Masse. The ministers answered, that in good conscience they could not beginne to dispute, afore they had prayed to God, and for the Doctors they had libertie, either to assiste or be absent from their prayers at their pleasure: but touching them selues, they were content to make their prayers in the place where the assembly and conference shoulde bee, onely they sayde there was greate difference betweene their prayers (which haue conformitie with the pure worde of God, as they them selues confesse,) and the matter of their Masse, which conteynes many things quite contrary, as is easily seene and iudged by suche as will examine it by the rule of the Scripture, and therfore (by reason of the impietie and idolatrie in their Masse) as they can not any way communicate therewith without offence to God, and bring them selues guyltie afore him: so yet, neither he nor the other Doctors his companions, stode barde from the societie of their prayers by that difficultie, bicause there was neither poynt nor article, which (by their owne confession) was not holly and consonant to God. Doctor Ruze replied, that they rested vpon a small matter: but they answered him, that as the principall exercise of Christian religion stode vppon prayer, so it was also the moste necessarie meane to obtayne Gods grace, without the which mortall men coulde not attayne to any successe in their doings, and therefore very dangerous to omitte it: they tolde him also, that they marueled on his behalfe, that professing the name of a Doctor and a Diuine, he made such a negligent estimation of prayer, which is the true practise, fruite, and vse of all the knowledge touching God and his worde, like as by this the worlde might discerne, what was the nature of their

iudge-

iudgementes, who measured diuinitie by idle and vayne speculations. He answered that the Duke of Montpensier would neuer suffer such a brauerie in his house, and muche lesse that it should be sayde, that it was a place for the Ministers to make their prayers in. The ministers protested to be farre from their profession to braue it, and that muche lesse they would vse any brauerie towards Princes (whom they honored with all feare and obedience) but that they would condemne themselues if they vsed it to any man, of what meane condition soeuer he were: wherwith they assured him, that aswell he as others, which layde such slaunders vpon them afore Princes, to kindle & enflame them against them, shoulde one day giue reason of their doings afore the maiestie of God. Here Doctor Ruze asked them why they stode so resolutely vpon this poynt of prayer: they answered, that the purpose of the Conference, was to reueale the true sense of the Scripture, and deliuer it to the vnderstanding of the Hearers, which coulde not be done without the spirite of God, who cleareth the vnderstanding of men to comprehende it, and openeth their mouthes to pronounce it, in which respecte they are to implore and obteyne Gods grace by prayers: besides, God hath commaunded all suche as haue nede of wisedome, to demaunde it of him, to searche what they would finde, & to knocke at the gate if they would haue it opened to them: all which beeing not otherwise to be obteyned than by prayers, they concluded, that for that occasion their inuocation was necessarie. They alleaged moreouer, that all things ought to be referred to the glory of god, and therefore prayer to be requisite in the beginning, and thankesgiuing in the ende, and consummation of all our indeuers, euen as when wee begin and ende the ordinary refection of our bodies, wee bleese and glorifie the name of God.

Here Doctor Ruze tolde them that they should not haue any let to pray, so that they prayed in their hartes: but they answered, that that suffised not, but that they muste aswell exercise their mouth, as S. Paule commaundes. Then withdraw you apart (sayth he) and make your prayers alone:

they tolde him that was also inconuenient in suche a presence, as being commaunded by God to make their lighte shine afore men, to the ende, that seing their good worke, they might haue meane to glorifie God, and be edified therewith: besides, by this they might procure cause of slaunder to their neighbours, as to confirme the lewde opinion rayled by their aduersaries touching their doctrine and exercises, which is, that in respecte of the errours and blasphemies, they durste not publish it: and therefore the better to purge this reproche, they thought it moste conuenient, that as they were to speake publikely, so also their prayers might not be kepte from the hearers. Lastly they sayde, in reason and duetie they ought not to be denied there the authoritie which the king had agreed vnto them in the conference at *Poyssy*, where in all the seuerall assemblies it was lawefull for them to make publike prayer to God, afore they entered any speeche of disputation. They added for their laste reason, that it was nedefull to comprehende within their prayers, bothe they & al such as should assiste the conference, to the ende that by the helpe of Gods grace, aswel they as others might be made cleane from all passions, as being hindered with nothing to iudge rightly of suche matters as shall fall in question of the one and other side, leaning by that meanes a facilitie to the hearers the better to make their profite. I am ashamed to recite in this place a worde which escaped from doctor Ruze in this talke, who in a disdayne to God and his seruice, sayde, that if the ministers wold go pray, he wold go pisse the while: the same seeming so impudente to the ministers, that they cried, what resolution, what counsell, yea what one good worde to be hoped for in a heart filled with suche apparant, disdayne of God?

The Duke of Buyllon, and the sayde Doctor Ruze, seing the constancie of the Ministers not to enter Conference, onelesse they prayed publikely in the presence of the assemblie, after they had imparted the same with the lord of Montpensier, and the other doctors that were with him, they determined to leuue them away, as not meaning to dispute with-

them

them vnder suche condition.

Whereupon the Ministers departed, & being called backe againe before they were at our Ladies bridge, they returned with expectation of cõsent to their request, wherin notwithstanding they were deceiued. For Doctor Ruze meeting them at the gate, tolde them for a finall Resolution, that if they wold pray, they shoulde haue a house appoynted for that purpose: only the Lord of Montpensier wold not suffer them to make his house their place of Prayer, nor that any of his household partake with their Prayers: whereunto the Ministers Answered, that in this, their request was rather restrained than satisfied, and therefore they coulde Answere them no otherwayes than afore.

Heere Doctor Ruze ministred particular speeche to Spyna, to whom in scoffing manner, he told, that he saw two causes why he was of so hard a desire to be drawn into disputation, and that heeretofore he had bene of their secte and companie, but now he was cut of. Spyna Answered, that if he had ment to eschue the conference, he wold not haue taken the trauaile of. viij. leagues in so great distemper of heat, and muche lesse left his Churche, more deare to him than any other thing, to come to them in their owne houses. Touching his departing from their societie, he estemed it one of the greatest benefits that euer happened to him, for the which he had cause to yeld continual thankes to God. And because neither he nor his fellowship should dout indirectly of his readinesse to dispute, he laide afore him a meane by which bothe parties might be satisfied, as to trauerse the disputation by writting, the same being moste conuenient, to intercepte all contentions: that the Arguments and Answers may be the better handled and vnderstand: that the people shuld be the better edified: And lastly, that in this manner there was no daunger of alterations, either by additions or detractions: Ruze Answered that nothing could be written, which hath not earst bene written: euen so sayth Spyna we can pronounce nothing, which heretofore hath not bene spoken.

This was the Resolute end of all their speeches, by which

may be gathered the will and disposition of the doctors to enter the conference with the Ministers: to whome euen in the beginning, to preuent their further proceeding, they offered a condition which they knewe would not be accepted, as to enter into a publike conference of the scripture, and yet barde to pray publikely in the place and assistance where they shuld dispute. Besides, their intente is easily iudged by the order they established touching the conference: For in place to prouide conueniently for the ease and quiette of the Ministers, come with no smal paines to them, they had procured at least a hundred persons of all qualities to enuiron the saide Ministers, and so to amaze them, either with irreuerente scoffes, violent iniuries, or inciuils threates, that had not the three Gentlemen of the Duke of Buyllon, kept a precise care ouer them, they had bene in daunger of violent hurt. By their dealings also may be discerned their regarde of duetie to God and holy Prayer, seeing they could not admit Prayer in their presence. And lastly, what vnderstanding can they haue of the scripture, with what Faith can they handle Gods Mysteries, yea with what integritie and facultie can they preach and pronounce, seeing they disdaine in their presence Prayer to God to obtaine all things, as though their sufficiencie were in aide of themselues, and not to proceede from God the Author of all lighte?

# ¶ The first disputation of Tuesday, the ninth of Iuly. 1566.



IT did not suffice the Doctors, by their inciuill meanes remembred in the Preface, to offer to reuerse the conference appointed betweene them & the two Ministers: but also, (the rather to intercept the full perswasion of the world in the matter of their intowardnesse, to enter so holy an exercise, they suborned a brute against the Ministers: that being no lesse priuie to the weaknesse of their cause, than their doctrine euill assured, they refuse to dispute. The same spreading to the eares of the king and Queene, & also the Lord Admiral, who foreseing the daungerous slaunder that might discende to the reformed Churches, if the cause were not wisely and spedily gouerned, and construing withall, this corrupt imputation to be layde vpon the Ministers, the rather to deface their innocencie: stode in their excuse afore their Maiesties, whom he assured of a prompt readynesse in the Ministers, to common with the Doctors in the defence of their Church and confession, and that by infallible Scripture, where and afore what reuerend testimonie they should be brought, so that their libertie to pray to God in their beginning (as they had desired) were not taken awaye, & meanes for good order established, the better to bryde the confusion of popular showtes and voyces, as happen ordinarily in the Schooles of Sophisters, and people inclyned to cauell.

Thys speache of the Lord Admirall kindled such a sense of reason in the Lorde of Neuers, that, induced chiefly by the spirite of God, and partly by an heroycall instinct of heart, laboring in desire to aspire to the direct truth of things: hee became a suter to their Maiesties, that by their authoritie and

suffraunce, the sayde disputation might proceede, and be eftsones restored: wherein as he preuayled to the full effect of his request and purpose: so, after he had ymparted wyth the Lorde Admirall the disposition of the King and Queene, they joyned in deuise touching the order to be obserued in the sayd conference, naming the sayde Lorde of Neuers, and the Duke of Buyllon, as Presidents of the place, wyth certaine numbers of Gentlemen mutuall assistauntes to recorde and witnesse the manner of their procedings, prouyding lastly two Notaries of Parys, for eyther side to subsigne and set downe in wryting the true discourse of eyther seuerall parties.

These condicions thus determined by the Lordes, were also receyued of the Doctors Vigor and De sainctes for the Papistes, and De spina and Sureau Ministers: Assembling, according to the appointment the ninth of July, at the Lorde of Neuers house, where, in hys presence and hearing of the reast of the assistants, after the Ministers had prayed, which the Doctors did shonne, (as retyring elsewhere till they had done) Doctor Vigor vndertoke the first speeche, with protestation that neyther he nor his companion came thyther to enter argument with the Ministers in any neede or meaning to be instructed in pointes of religion, and much lesse to impugne in any sort the counsels, and specially that of Trent, by which they were forbidden to dispute with Heretikes: Assuring resolutely for themselues, to abyde constantly in the fayth of the Church of Rome: onely such was the request of the Lorde of Montpensier (who to reclaime his daughter the Lady of Buyllon, had procured that conference) as they were the rather drawne thyther, aswell to satisfie hym, as also to declare their holy zeale to seeke and bring agayne to their flock, such as were gone astray.

The Ministers for their partes protested lykewise, not to be enforced to conference by any doubt they made in anye article of their confession, as knowing the same to consent simplie and fully with the perfite worde of God, but rather

to

to strengthen and defende it agaynst the Sophistries of such as seke to impugne it, pretending also to kepe and establish the sayde vertuous Ladie of Buyllon, in that state and holye institution, which Gods grace had happily instilled into hir.

These protestations thus mutually alledged, the Ministers loked that the Doctors (according to the meaning of the Lorde of Montpensier, and desire of his daughter) woulde beginne their disputation, with the matter of the supper, and the Masse: albeit, using the example and policy of such, as pretending the siege and batterie of a towne, beginne to raise their Trenches a farre off: so they, the better to prepare themselues to decyde and consult in the sayde two poyntes, began to lay their foundation by the authoritie of the church, vpon the which they sought to establishe the certaintie of the articles of fayth, and generally of all the holye scripture: And so the demaundes and obiections passing from the Doctors, and aunswers returned by the Ministers: De sainctes began, and Despina, aunswered as followeth.

Question.

Upon what doe you establishe your religion?

Aunswere.

Upon Gods worde.

Question.

What vnderstande or meane you by Gods worde?

Aunswere.

The writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

Question.

Doe ye receyue by their writinges all the bookes of the Byble, as well of the olde as newe Testament, gyuing to them all an equall authoritie?

Aunswere.

No, but according to the instruction of antiquitie, we vse distinction betweene the Canonical and Apocryphall bookes, calling such canonicall, vpon whose doctrine, both faith and all christian religion is founded, and the other we name apo-

eryphall, as vpon whose authoritie we cannot establishe any article of fayth: onely they are proper (in respect of their notable sentences) to instruct the state of lyfe and maners of christians.

Question.

Howe know you that the one are canonicall, and the other apocryphall?

Aunswere.

By the spirite of God, which is a spirite of discretion, gyuing lyght to all such to whom it is communicated, to make them capable of power to iudge & discerne spirituall things, and comprehende the truth (when it is propounded to them) by the testimonie and assuraunce which he kindles in their hearts: wherein, as we discerne the light and darkenesse by the facultie of the sight that is in our eye, euen so being furnished with Gods spirite, and guyded by the lyght which he kindles in our hartes, may we easily deuyde and knowe the truth from deceyt, and generally all other thinges, which may contayne falshode, absurditie, doubt, or difference.

Question.

But some may vaunt to haue the spirite of God, which haue him not, lyke as we finde by the hystories, that all the heretikes thought assuredly to haue the truth on their sides, studying to authorize their doctrine by the inwarde reuelations, which they fayned to receyue of Gods spirite: by which may appeare what daunger it were to reappose or commyt the censure of a booke or doctrine to the testimonie of Gods spirite, which a priuate man perswades or faynes to haue receyued in his hart.

Aunswere.

This perill is easily auoyded by ỹ aduise of the Euangelist Iohn in his first Catholike, as not to settle an indifferent beliefe to al spirites, but rather to proue and examine them diligently afore we admit them, and then allow what they propownde: wherein the examination which we ought to make in thys case, is to consider, first the ende of the doctrine that

shall

shall be pronounced, & purpose of any booke presented to vs: For if it tende to rayse and establishe the glorie of God, it is true, according to the wordes of Jesus Christ in Iohn, hee that searcheth Gods glorie is true, and there is no iniustice in him: in this viewe and examination, we haue also to consider, that if it consent with the proportion and analogie of fayth (as Paule sayth) it agrees fully with the chiefe groundes of religion. Cap.7.18. Rom.12.6

Question.

All men say, and may saye as much, but for this reason it is an argument insufficient, tyll I be warranted by effect and other proofes, how I may rest and stay my selfe vppon it: Besides, this aunswere exceedes the lymites of the proposition, as presupposing the scripture to be knowne to be the grounde of religion: and the proposition was layde to giue the reason to assure me that the scripture was of God: and that we must put a distinction betweene the bookes of the same.

Aunswere.

It is easie to iudge, whether the ende of the doctrine which is propounded, stretch to establishe and exalt the honor and glorie of God, as if the same moue exhortations to men, to withdrawe wholly their trust from creatures, and reappose and lay it altogyther vpon God, to haue recourse to hym in their necessities, to depende vpon his prouidence in all their transitorie affayres, and lastly to prayse hym with thankesgyuing for all the benefits they haue: which being presupposed, there is no doubt that the doctrine including this purpose and ende, is not good and to be receyued: touching the obiection, that our former aunswere fell from the boundes of the first proposition, it seemes not so, because the first matter propounded, tended to knowe what was the grounde of our religion, to the which it was aunswered, that it was the writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

Question.

This aunswere is common to the Lutherans and Anabaptistes,

baptistes, yea and to the Deistes, who aboue the reast professe to searche the glorie of God, and what else the aunswere conteynes: and generally all men, vsing this speech, coulde not but erre in all the articles of the Créede, except the first: But to cut of this circumstance of speeche, and returne to the point, we thinke it not lawfull to vse a foundation of the scripture, afore it be knowne and assured that it is the holye scripture, and that there is difference betweene the bookes of the same: and also afore it be manifest, that I haue a particuler inspiration of the holye spirite, and that such a priuate breathing of the holy ghost be a sufficient ground of religion.

Aunswere.

The Deistes, or other heretikes, can not serue their turne with the sayde aunswere, for the confirmation of their errors, bicause the Deistes, denying Iesus Christ, can not glorifie God, seing that to glorifie the father, it is nedefull first to knowe and glorifie the sonne: and euen so the other heretikes, who not knowing the truth, nor by consequent, Iesus Christ (which is the waye, the lyfe, and the truth) muste nedes be ignorannt of God, and howe to glorifie hym. And where our aunswere is noted superfluous, or to wander indecently, we lay our selues to be measured and iudged by the conference of the demaunde and aunswere: And touching the last point of the obiection, that the reuelation which a priuate man sayth he hath of the spirite of God, is to hym as a grounde of religion: that is without the sense & wordes of our aunswere, which stretched onely to laye the foundation of true religion vpon the doctrine of the Prophetes and Apostles: of whose truth all the church generally, and euerie particuler member of the same, are assured by the testimonie and inwarde reuelation of the spirite of God.

Question.

All that is here spoken, muste be added to the other aunswere afore it be good: and it semes that the aunswere contaynes but matter of mockerie: For it is most certaine, that when all truth is in the doctrine of one man, he is no

more

more wicked or an heretike: But we search still the beginning of truth, and what it ought to be: And touching the replye, denying that the particuler reuelation is the ground of religion, there is no great difference: For if the particuler reuelation be a sufficient grounde for euery one to know that which is of the Apostles and Prophets, it is by consequent the foundation of religion, as being the grounde to know vpon what euerie particuler man knoweth and sayth his religion is founded.

Aunswere.

We framed our aunsweres according to the nature and maner of the demaunds, by which appeares no likelihode of disposition to scoffe or iest: seeing that in such a conference as this is, where is question to searche the honor and glory of God, mockerie could not be without impietie: But touching reuelation to be like to the scripture (which is the grounde of religion) we denie it, and affirme them to be things different, notwithstanding their continuation, as following one an other, according as it is written in Esay: Beholde my allyance with them, sayth the Lorde, my spirite which is in thee, & the wordes which I haue breathed into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy lippes, nor from the mouth of thy seede, and so as followeth: by which maye be iudged the distinction that the Prophet vseth betweene the reuelation of the holy spirite, and the worde. Cap. 59. &. 21.

Question.

I leaue (for conclusion of this conference) euerye one to iudge of the conuenience or agreement of the aunsweres and obiections. And touching the wordes alledged out of Esay, of the vnitie of the worde and holy spirite, they be but speeches without purpose, and newe matter: neyther ought we to compare the reuelation of euerye particuler man (which was the question) with that of the Prophet Esay, who had the other prowes that the holy ghost spake by him, and made demonstration thereof many times. Lastly, what soeuer is alledged, I leaue to the iudgement of euerye christian.

stian.

Aunswere.

Euen so also we referre to iudgement what hath bene inferred mutuallie of the one & other part: And touching the place of Esay, which we produced, there is no question at all of the reuelation of the Prophet, nor the spirite that was communicated to hym, but onely of the spirite and wordes which God promised to all his people, with whome he entred his alliance. For the other prokes pretended, that the Prophete had of his vocation, we make no doubt at all of them, onely we protest that to be principall and most assured which he had by the testimonie of Gods spirite, as appeareth in the first Chapter of his prophecie.

Question.

Be it that he spake to his people by the person of Esay, yet it followes not, but that he spake first to Esay, neyther doe I denie that he promised not his spirite to his people, meaning to his vniuersall Church, not that he would that euery one, yea being in thys church might vsurpe or vaunt to haue this spirite promised particulerly: And touching the particuler inspiration of Esay, it was not founded onely on his fancie and presumption, but in the assurannce which God gaue him in supernaturall workes, as is witnessed in hys first chapter: Besides, it was not sufficiently grounded to be beleeued, as to haue an inspiration, if he had not declared it by other effects and prophesies which hapned, as belonges to euerie Prophete to doe afore he beleeued. But referring all these things as matters fetched from farre, and out of the first proposition, I leaue the iudgement as before.

Deut.28.

Aunswere.

There is not one of the church, if he be a true member of the same, to whome the spirite of God is not communicated according to the testimonie of the Apostle Paule, and also the Euangelist Iohn in his first Catholike. For the presumption pretended, there is great difference betweene presumption and the imaginations of the spirite of man (which is but dark-

Rom.8.9. Chap.2. 20.27.

darkneſſe, and of himſelfe knoweth nothing in the things of God) and the Reuelatiõs of the holy ſpirite, which are moſt certaine, and of no leſſe aſſurance. And ſo laſtly touching our Anſweres to be out of the firſt matter of ſpeeche. If they be ſo, ſo alſo are the Demaundes.

Obiection.

The Concluſion is, whether euery one ought to be beléeued, ſaying he hath a particulare Reuelation of the holy ſpirite, without Declaration otherwayes, that there be holy Scriptures, and that there is difference betweene the ſame: Let euery one be iudge whether the Demaundes and Aunſweres be pertinent to this difficultie or not, like as alſo whether the one importe more credite and beléefe than the other, as the one béeing a newe Doctrine, ſhewes not any proofe more than the other, of their particular inſpiration.

Aunſwere.

In our former Anſwers we haue declared howe the Reuelations ſuppoſed by particulare perſons, ought to be examined by ſuche meanes, as they may be diſcerned whether they be of Gods ſpirite or not. Were Doctor Vigor intercepted his further ſpeeche, ſaying: that in the diſcourſe aforeſaide, he vnderſtode muche matter in the myniſters Aunſwers, to be againſt the worde of God, as where it is ſayde, that firſt the Sonne muſt be honored afore the father: which Spyna mainteined to be vndoutedly true, alleaging that propoſition to haue his ground and authoritie on the holy ſcriptures, as in the goſpel and firſt Catholike of S Iohn: Whervnto Vigor Replies, that in the ſaide places is not founde this worde firſte, albeit, in reſpecte not to incident the matters alleaged in the beginning of the conference, he wil forbeare for the preſent, to enter into Confutation, reſeruing that charge, til the ende of al the conference.

Aunſwere.

Spyna requires Doctor Vigor to coate the places of ſcripture, which he pretendes to be contrary to the contentes of his Aunſwere: And to iuſtifie his opinion, to glorifie firſt the Sonne afore the Father, (according to the teſtimonie of the

tertes afore noted) he preferres this reason grounded and drawne out of the Scriptures: we can not knowe the Father, onelle we haue knowne the Sonne: we can not glorifie the Father, onelle we haue knowne him: by which the consequence foloweth, that the knowledge and glorie of the Sonne, is a degree to come to the knowledge and glorie of the Father: which being referred by Vigor to be more amplie debated in the conclusion of the whole conference, Spina was also content.

Obiection.

Vigor Obiectes, without entring further into this disputation, that by the selfe same reason inferred by Spina, it foloweth that we must honoure the Father afore the Sonne: for by the Father we come to the knowledge of the Sonne, as appeareth by the wordes of our Lord to S. Peter, *Caro & sanguis nō reuelauit tibi: sed pater meꝰ qui in cœlis est*: The same auouching manifestly that the heauenly Father reuealed to S Peter, that our Lord was the Sonne of the liuing God: Whereupon Vigor argues in this sorte, whether the reason of Spina be vatleable: by the Father we knowe the Sonne, therefore muste we firste honoure the Father afore the Sonne.

Aunswere.

To followe the order of the knowledge which we oughte to haue of Jesus Christe and his Father propouned to vs in S Iohn, we must begin by the Sonne, and from the Sonne to the Father. For S. Philip desiring him once to shew to him and his companions his Father: He answered, Philip, who hath seene me, hath also seene my Father, the same teaching that the meane to come to the knowledge of the Father, is a former knoweledge of the Sonne: which may be also approued by the Authorities of other places, where Jesus Christe saithe, that none knoweth the Father but the Sonne, and he to whome the Sonne wil reueale him: And to aunsweare the Authoritie of S Mathewe alledged by Vigor, Spina saithe, that the place by him prodnced, contained no mention of the knowledge of the Father, nor the

meane

meane to come thereunto, but only of the Reuelation which was made by the grace of God and his holy spirite to S. Peter and his other companions to know Jesus Christ, and in him, his Father.

Whereupon Vigor calles vppon the iudgemente of the Auditorie, whether this be an Answere to his Obiection, reseruing notwithstanding till an other conference, to handle this pointe more largely (if he wil maintene it) as not now to incident that which hath bene proponed, whereunto Spina consentes: Vigor addes further vpon an Answere made by Spina, where he vsed a difference betweene the Reuelation certaine by the Lorde to a particulare man, and the holy Scripture, in which Answere he seemes to put a maruell, the rather for that there is no Faithe giuen to holye Scriptures, but only that the Lorde is the Author thereof, who can not lie: euen so if a particular man be assured that a Reuelation is made to him by the Lorde, or that a persone be assured of the Reuelation made to an other, be bound asmuch to giue faith to the Reuelation, as to the scripture, the which matter also he will not (as he may) amplie handle and deduce, but falles eftsones vpon the first Question, which as yet hathe not bene resolued, to the which he prayes Spina to aduaunce and prepare himselfe.

Answere.

The cause of Vigors maruell touching the Reuelation of the Lorde, and the worde, to be thinges differing, produced in one of Spinas Answeres, moues, in that he conceiues not the sense and meaning of the speeche: For Spina will not put a difference touching the certaintie betweene the true Reuelations of the Lorde, and the worde, whiche proceeding from him, is no lesse true than the Reuelation, and the Reuelation of Reciprocal Faithe with the worde, and yet it followes not for all that, that the worde and Reuelations of Goddes spirite, (by whiche we may be leade to the vnderstanding of the worde) be not things differente, and that the one goeth not afore the other. And touching Vigors requeste to prepare to the pointe, he Answereth that he can

not frame or draw his Answers from other grounde, than the Demaundes that are made him.

To this Vigor Replied, that touching the sense, he layeth him selfe vpon the contentes of Spinas Aunswere: And where he saithe that the worde goeth afore the Reuelation, that deserues not to set a difference vppon the question propouned. And touching the matter of the pointe, Vigor Demaundes, if a persone may be assured that he hath the Reuelation of the Lord, or that a Booke be a Booke of holy scripture, and when he may iudge assuredly of his inwarde inspiration: And lastly how he may assertaine any of this inspiration which he hath of the Lord.

Aunswere.

The first Article of the last demaunde, is not a thing impertinent to distinguishe the scripture from the interpretation of the same: seeing they are matters diuers, and sundry giftes of the Lord. And to answer that part of the demaund, how a particulare man, hauing in his heart the Reuelation and inwarde witnesse of Gods spirite, may knowe that it is Canonical, the spirite of God is not different of him selfe, and abiding in a particular man, he shall alwayes acknowledge the Scripture that comes of him, and which beares his markes: And touching the second demaund, we say also that the same spirite being in a third man, shal acknowledge that aswell the worde, as the Reuelation are of him by the reasons alledged, that is, that Gods spirite in diuers persones, is alwayes equal and like to himselfe.

Obiection.

This dothe not satisfie the first Question proponed, which conteined a demaunde how any man can iudge in him selfe that he hath the holy spirit, to discerne and iudge a boke to be of the holy Scripture, and an other not to be but Apocryphall, and lastly how he can make demonstration to an other, that he is possessed with this inspiration of God.

Aunswere.

The spirite of God is called a seale in the Scripture, for that the first effecte he bringes forthe in the heart of him to

whom he is communicated, is, to assure him of his presence: And to assure a second of the Reuelation, which we haue receiued of Gods spirite, it is also easie, for that the spirite of God, which openeth the mouth of one to speake, openeth also the eares of an other to heare his worde, the heart to beleeue him, and himselfe to persuade it, so that betweene the maister and disciple, the Doctor and the hearer, being bothe furnished and lightened by Gods spirite, there is also a mutuall concorde to knowe one an other.

Obiection.

Suche a certaintie is a great incertaintie, neither is there any, of what secte so euer he be, who doth not assure him selfe to haue the holy spirite and truthe of his side, which is a fond presumption: howe may a man distinguishe a presumption from a true inspiration.

Aunswere.

S. Iohn Chrysostome saith, that in vaine doth a man vaūte himselfe to haue the spirite withoute the worde, which is a meane to represse sectes and heresies, and to iudge all matters that the heretikes and others would propounde vnder the authoritie and title of Gods spirite: For as by this spirite we knowe the true sense of the word, euen so do we discerne mutually by the word, who they be that haue the spirite of God, and who not.

Obiection.

This is no Aunswere to the Demaunde, for there is no Question to examine the doctrine by the word, but to know that it be the worde of God, by whiche we wil examine the doctrine, and approue it: and how a man shall iudge assuredly that he hath a Reuelation of the Lord, and that it be Gods worde.

Aunswere.

If he be one of the faithfull, he may iudge by Gods spirite that is in him, as in him that telles it him. And if he be of the vnfaithfull, it is as impossible that he iudge, as a blinde man to discerne colours laid afore him, because (as S. Paule saith) it is by the spirite of God, by whom we knowe and iudge the

things that are of God.

Obiection.

This Aunswere is yet insufficient to the Question produced, wherof let the iudgement rest among the hearers and Readers: But now wee put forth an other demaund, whether wee are certaine by Gods worde, that the Lord assistes his Churche, and will assiste it vntill the consummation of the worlde. And whether there be not more assurance to staie vpon the consentes, and iudgement of the Church touching the determination of the Canonical Bookes of the holy Scripture, and the distinction of the same from the Apocryphall, than to rest vpon singular iudgement, esteeming it to be an inwarde inspiration, of the whiche there can be no proofe made, but only by opinion ý wee haue the holy spirite.

Aunswere.

The Doctors confuse the opinions of the fantastical sort, with the testimonies, and Reuelations of the Holy Spirite, notwithstanding there is asmuch distinction betweene them two, as from heauen to earth: And touching the consente of the Churche, supposed to procede of the Spirite of God, it is infallible, and of no lesse certaintie, than the particulare Reuelations of Esay, and other Prophetes: And because both the one and the other procede of one Authour (whiche is the Spirite of Truth) the certeintie of the Reuelations of Gods Spirite, made to al the Church in generall, & to euery particular member of the same, conteine one self poyse, & weight.

Obiection.

The Ministers cannot conceale from the Catholikes, or others, but that they are fantastike, as making no proofe of the Reuelation of the Holy Spirite made to them, no more than other sectes dw: And touching that pointe, supposed that it procedes of Gods spirit, they seeme to dout of the assistance of the Holy spirite in Gods Church: whiche (as S. Paule saith) 1. Tim 3. 15 *Est columna, & firmamentum Veritatis*: Wherein is to be wel considered, that they hold them more certaine of the assistance of the Lorde in particulare, than in the vniuersall Church, by which the conclusion may followe, that al yet the



particu-

particular faithful can neuer straie, as also that he is a piller of truth no lesse than the vniuersal Churche: besides, in laying the particular Reuelations in equal ballaunce & weight with the iudgement of the Church, they do openly impugne their confession of faith, in the fourth Article, wher it is thus written, Wee know these Bookes to be Canonical, & a most certaine rule of our faith, not so much by the common accord & consent of the Church, as the testimonies and inward persuasion of the holy spirite, who makes vs discerne them from the other ecclesiastical Bookes: By the said Article it is seene howe muche they do attribute to them selues, more than to the whole vniuersal Church, which Article, they do now resist, giuing asmuch to the one, as to the other: yea, in the confession of faithe lastly printed, the saide Article was taken awaye, as appeareth by that whiche this daye Spyna hathe broughte hither printed at Geneua, 1564. by whiche may be seene, that they retracte them selues, as confessing that it behoues more te staie vpon the common consents of ỳ church, than vpon particulare: the same being reasonable, seeing the holy spirite is promised to the vniuersal Churche, and not to euery particulars man.

Aunswere.

If the Ministers may be thoughte fantasticke, notwithstanding they haue Gods worde, with better proofe the Doctors maie be holden such, in matters which they mainteine and defende both without & against Gods worde: touching the seconde poinct, requiring the Ministers that they dout of the assistaunce of the spirite of God to the Church, your aunswere is, that the dout is not there, but to know which is the true Church: For the third point, where the Doctors allege that it maie be inferred, that particular menne cannot erre, the consequence is nothing worthe, bicause the Spirite of God maye sometime departe from menne, in whiche case they maye faile and erre, as Dauid confesseth, did happen to him. Psal. 30.

To the fourthe pointe the Ministers aunswere, that they impugne not in any sorte the Article alleaged of their confession, bicause the Aunswere conteined

compari-

comparison of two Reuelations of the spirite, the one made to the body, and the other to the members, which they maintaine to be of equal value touching the certaintie: and in the confession is mention made of the Reuelation of Gods spirite, which causeth the consent of the Churche, which foloweth thereof, as the effecte. And if it be so, that the cause being preferred afore his effect, there is greate reason that the Reuelation of the spirite of God, compared with the consent of the Churche, should be preferred afore it, as the cause to the effect which it produceth. And touching the cõtrarietie which they pretend in Confessions Printed in diuers seasons, and by sundrie Printers, they shall be Aunswered, when their pleasure is to debate the Articles particularly.

Question.

Where they made a doubt of the true Church, euen ẏ like may be said of ẏ Reuelations pretẽded of Gods spirit to particular men, whom also we may vont whether they be members of the Church or not: Touching the other point, where they denie to impugne the fourthe Article of their Confession, there seemes no small contradiction, as comparing the particular Reuelation with the consent of the church, as appeareth by their Aunswere: it seemes also to serue to small purpose, where they alledge the Reuelation to be the cause of the consent, preferring it afore the same, as the cause afore the effecte, the same seeming as who should say, the Reuelation is to be preferred afore the word of God and holy scripture, for it is moste certaine that the Reuelation goeth before the worde and scripture. And as it appeares in the texte of the Confession (which may be easily iudged) the Authors of the same speake of the certaintie and infallibilitie of two Reuelations, as holding themselues more assured of that they haue in their spirite, than that which is of the iudgemẽt of the churche: Touching the other pointe, that particulare men may sometimes faile, when Gods spirite leaues them, we may conclude by that we ought not to rest infallibly vpon the inspirations pretended of particulare men, bicause it may be douted whether they be forsaken of Gods spirite or not,

not, which we can not do of the Church, therefore it is more assured to stay vpon the Churche infallibly governed by the holy spirite, than vpon the priuate pretended inspirations, which the Catholikes do, not folowing their priuate iudgement, and therfore can not be esteemed fantastike: but rather such are guiltie of that name, who prefer their proper iudgement, which they couer with the title of particulare inspiration: The Doctors require a texte of the Scripture, by the which the holy spirite is promised to euery particulare person, as to the vniuersal church, therby to know how to iudge and discerne what be the scriptures.

Aunsvvere.

Touching the first pointe, as in deede we do not approue all churches to be true, which are so said, euen so we allowe not for faithfull, suche as vaunt them selues to be so. For the second, the comparison of the Doctoures is improper in this pointe, as who should say the Reuelation is to be preferred afore the worde of God. &c. Bicause Gods worde and all the writings aswel of the Prophetes as Apostles, are as so many Reuelations of Gods spirite, and that betweene the one and the other, there is no more difference, than betweene *genus* and *species*: Touching the Article, that the Reuelation goeth before the scripture, we muste distinguishe betweene the Reuelations made to the Prophets before they committed them to writing, and those which are made to them, that read their writings to understande them: For the first, we confesse they goe before the scripture, and for the seconde we say they folowe it: Touching the third Article, the ministers Aunswere, that it is easie to iudge whether Gods spirite assist a particulare man, or whether he be drawne from him, by the matters he propoundes, when they be conferred with Gods worde, and censured by the rules of the same, as is saide.

Touching their demaunde, it were a long and weary encomber, to alleage all the places where it is written, that Gods spirite is communicated to the chosen, the better to knowe and discerne the things that are of God: in Esay. 55.

the Lord promiseth to poure his spirite vppon the faithfull, as water vpon the earthe: Likewise in Ioel.2 Ieremie.34. in the first Catholike of S. Iohn.2. vnder the name of vnction, and many other places.

Obiection.

These places make no proofe at all, that the spirite was promised to all to iudge of the Doctrine: Other wayes, euen women, and all artificers that were faithfull, might iudge of the Doctrine, as the Prophetes and Apostles: of the contrary S. Paule saithe: *Numquid omnes Prophetæ. &c.* He saithe expressely, that discretion of Spirites is to haue vnderstanding of the scriptures, and be giftes not common to all the faithfull, but particulare to some.

Aunswere.

The consequence which the Doctors make, is nothing worthe, bicause Gods spirite oftentimes is communicated more abundantly to some, than to others, and that also some be better exercised in the scriptures than others. Touching the place of S. Paule. 1. Corinth. 12. the ministers say, it makes nothing against them, bicause the spirite of Prophecie, and the spirite of discretion be giftes differing, as appeares by the discourse of the Apostle in the same Chapter.

The

# The second day of disputation,

## being VVednesday the tenth of July.

THe Doctors required that their Protestation made the day before, might be Inregistred, which was this, that they would not enter into disputation of things receiued into the vniuersall Churche, since the Apostles till our time, decided and already determined by the holy Councels Ecumenike and general, holding them most certaine and vndouted, and that all Doctrine to the contrary was false: Onely they were ready, according to the holy desire of the Lorde Montpensier, and the Ladie of Buillon his daughter, to make knowne by the expresse worde of God, interpreted by the saide vniuersall Churche and Councels, that their Doctrine is holy and conducible to saluation, in which Doctrine as the saide Ladie had bene first instructed, so all instruction ministred to her in the contrary, is hurtful and damnable: And lastly, that this conference might be in manner of instruction, and not a Disputation.

In like sorte the Ministers protested, that they did not ioyne in assemblie with the Doctoures, for any doubte they had, that all that was contained in their Confession of faith, was not certaine and true, and grounded vpon Gods worde, as appeareth by the places of Scripture noted in the Pargent of the sayde Confession, beleeuing that what so euer is contrary, is damnable and to be reiected, thoughe euen an Aungell of heauen would propone it. And touching themselues, they came not thither to be instructed in other Doctrine than that which they folowe, and which they haue learned of Iesus Christe, whome they acknowledge as the only maister and teacher of the churche.

Heere the Lorde of Neuers made request, that after their Obiections and Aunsweres, they would proceede to Resolution on both sides, touching the conference the day before.

Accoꝛding to which motion, the Doctoꝛs say, that to iudge of a Booke, whether it be wꝛitten of the holy scripture oꝛ not, and likewise to discerne a Canonicall Booke, from an Apocriphal oꝛ Ecclesiastical, we must not rest vpon a pꝛiuate, oꝛ particulare inspiration, because a singulare persone can not haue any oꝛdinarie certaintie, that it is a true Reuelation of the holy spirite: but stay vpon the common consent and accoꝛde of the vniuersal churche. And also that God notwithstanding he might haue reuealed to euery one ỹ true knowledge necessary to saluation, yet he hathe oꝛdained a certaine meane to attaine to faithe, which is a truthe reuealed, meaning by the hearing of Gods woꝛd, pꝛeached by lawfull ministers sent by the pastoꝛs of the true churche, as appeareth by the terte of S. Paule to the Romaines. 10. and Ephes. 4. So that, if they meane to haue faithe and inwarde Reuelation of the knowledge of saluation, come by the hearing of Gods woꝛde lawfully pꝛeached by the ministers of the same, accoꝛding to the oꝛdinarie meane of assurance, that we haue the inwarde Reuelation: it must necessarily be assured, that the woꝛde by which faithe is getten, hath bene pꝛeached by the lawfull ministers of the true church, & so by consequence be assured of the church, afoꝛe the inward Reuelation, obseruing the meane which Iesus Chꝛiste folowed: They say further, that the true and certaine marke of a true inwarde Reuelation, is, when it is referred to the common consente of the church. And that of the contrary euery pꝛetẽded inward inspiration particulare oꝛ pꝛiuate, is a false persuasion, if it differ from the common accoꝛde of the churche: foꝛ Gods spirite is not particulare, but common. They say also, that to take a false Doctrine, we must examine it to know whether it be pꝛiuate oꝛ common, like as our Lord in S. Iohn. 8. hathe giuen a true marke, saying: *Qui de se loquitur, mendatium loquitur*, he that saith any thing of himselfe, and his pꝛoper inspiration, is a lier. In like soꝛte, it is wꝛitten in Ezechiel, Sonne of man, Pꝛophecie against the Pꝛophetes of Israel which Pꝛophecie, & say to suche as Pꝛophecie in their heart, heare the woꝛde of the Lorde: So saithe the Lord, curse be

Chap. 13.

vpon

vpon the false Prophets, who follow their spirite, and haue sene nothing. And a little after, they see vaine things, and a Diuination ful of dreames, saying: the Lord saythe, and the Lord sent them not, and yet they haue giuen assurance to confirme the worde of their Prophesie: which false Prophets, said they, had ... inwarde Reuelation, and the worde of God.

They woulde also, that it be well wayed and considered, that the stay of religion grounded and assured vppon an inwarde inspiration, is the foundation of many sectes of our time, as Anabaptistes and Swinfeldiens, who lay their Doctrines vpon priuate reuelations, alleaging proper places to serue them as a grounde of their Doctrine, which the ministers inferred yesterday, as Ieremie in the.3. Chap. Ioel.2. and S. Paule, 1. Cor. 2. The which being considered by Brentius and Bucer, they haue confessed that by the only tradition of the church, we were ascertained of the Bookes of the holy scripture, according to the Doctrine of the auncientes, as S. Ierome, who confesseth to haue receiued by tradition of the churche, and by the same to haue knowne that there be foure gospels: Origen also saithe asmuch, who, reciting the Canonical Bookes of the newe Testament, saith: I haue learned by tradition, that there be foure gospels, neither is there foūd any auncient catholike that hath stayed his faith (to discerne and iudge of Bookes,) vpon his only priuate and particulare inspiration. And S. August. lib. confess. ca. 25. vseth these wordes, *Veritas tua Domine, non mea, nec illius, aut illius, sed omnium nostrum quos ad communionem aduocas: terribiliter admonemur priuatam veritatem habeamus, ne priuemur ea.*

And touching the Bookes of the olde Testament, whiche the Ministers will not receiue as Canonical, by the iudgement of their inwarde Reuelation, the Doctors auouche, that before S. Augustines time (or at the least) in his time, in the vniuersall churche, all the Bookes contained in the holy Bible without distinction, were holden and receiued as Canonicall, according to the testimonie of the Councel of *Carthage*, where S. Augustine was present, and also the Councell

*Laodicene*: the Doctors also saie, that if by inwarde inspiration we must iudge of Bookes, the Fathers that assisted those Councels, had it, or at leaste might persuade them selues to haue it with more assurance than many others: But where the Ministers saie, that by theire inwarde Reuelation, they iudge that they are not Canonicall, the Doctors referre to iudgemente, who oughte soneste to be beleeued, either the inspiration of the Auncientes receiued by the Churche by so many hundred yeres vntil this time, or the priuate, and particulare inspiration of the newe Ministers.

They saie further, that they offer to proue that the Auncient Fathers, euen suche as were neare the Apostles time, as Irenæus, S. Cyprian, Origen, S. Ierome, S. Augustine, and others, vse testimonies of Bookes reiected by the Ministers, euen in the proofe of the Doctrine against Heretikes: yea S. Augustine him selfe, in the seconde Booke of Christian Doctrine, Chap. 2. puttes all those Bookes amongeste the Canonicalles, as also Damascene in the fourthe Booke *De Orthodoxa Fide, Chap. 18.* So that to knowe if a man haue the spirite of God, to discerne and iudge of the Bookes of the Scripture, it behoues to reste vpon the common consente, and accorde of the Churche, as being the ordinarie meane of God lefte for that effecte: experience also whiche maie be made, is a sufficiente Argumente to conuince, that the Faithfull by the inwarde inspiration cannot discerne the Canonicall Bookes, from the pretended Apocryphall, which mighte be eaſily vereſied, if there were here at this presente euen somme of the Religion pretended reformed, to whom (not hauing beue as yet instructed in the diuision of Bookes) if those Bookes were presented, whiche the Ministers holde for Apocryphal, they would not distinguish them in any sort from the other Bookes of the holy Bible. And vpon all they conclude, that if a man haue Goddes spirite &c. vt supra.

Aunswere.

Touching the firste Article, the Ministers were neuer of opinion (as appeares in their former aunsweres) that their Religion was grounded vppon theire particulare Reue-

lations,

lations, but vpon the worde of God, according as it is sette forthe in the Writinges of the Prophetes and Apostles, the truthe of whiche they saide, was moste principally assured by the testimonie, and Reuelation of the holy Spirite.

They saie also, that Faithe is not the Truthe in proper speache, but the persuasion of the Truthe, whiche is taughte vs in the Scripture: Like as also this Faithe is not of our owne getting, but a pure gifte of God.

They saie further, that the lawfull Ministers oughte to be sente, not of Pastors pretended, and whiche haue nothing of Pastors, but the Title and name onely, but of God, as appeares in Ieremie, where this marke is sette forthe to knowe and marke a false Pastor, when he insinuates himselfe, or is sente of other than of God.

Touching the Article folowing, they saie, that the true marke by which we maie iudge certainely of a Reuelation, is rather the worde of God, than the consente of many, bicause it happeneth many times that the multitude in the Churche declining from the worde, dothe wholy swarue and goe astraie, as in the time of Micheas, Iesus Christe, and since, in the time of Constance the Emperour.

Touching those Prophetes, who folow and are leede by their spirite (as they that leaning Goddes worde, reste vpon the commaundementes and traditions of men, or the vanity of their braine) it is not to be douted that suche are not false Prophetes, and to be eschewed and reiected: onely wee muste vse greate difference betwene the Reuelations and testimonies of Goddes spirite, and the vaine imaginations of the minde of men.

To that the Doctors alleaged, that Heretikes (as Anabaptistes and others) serue theire turne, to confirme theire errors, with those places of scripture, whiche the Ministers haue produced: they denie not but it maie be so, for that the Scripture being common, maye be alleaged of euery one: Neither oughte wee to staie vppon that whiche is produced, but to weighe and examine howe, and to what ende and pourpose it is alleaged, by whiche will appeare

the

the difference that is betweene the Ministers and heretikes.

Touching that whiche was inferred of Brentius and Bucers opinion, that by the onely tradition of the Churche, the Canonical Bookes maye be discerned from the Apocryphal, the Doctoures seeme to misserue their purpose with that, seing they mainteine that all the Bookes of the Bible are Canonical, and yet, by their reporte of Brentius and Bucer, it appeares that both the one and the other, according to the Tradition (as they saie) do put a distinction, calling the one Canonical, and the other Apocryphall.

To the Article folowing, wherein the Doctors alleage certaine places of the auncients to take away the difference betweene the Canonical and Apocriphal Bokes: the Ministers answere, that as they haue alleaged certaine to proue it, so also they are able to produce of ỹ same for the disprofe, as S. Ierome in his Prologue named Chaleatus, and in an other which beginnes *frater Ambrosius* to whome writing the summe of euery Booke of the Bible, he makes no mention but of those, which the ministers call Canonicall: They are able also to alledge two or three Cataloges recited in Eusebius, who receiue not for Canonical Bokes, but suche as the ministers themselues approue. The Councell of *Laodicen* alleaged by the Doctors, speakes for the ministers, as not comprehending that, wherof there is question: and touching erperience, they answere that it is a question *de facto*, as being better to be alleaged againste the Doctors, than the ministers.

Lastly, to the ende no more time be spente in so often repetition of one selfe thing, and that we prepare to conferre the pointes of the Confession which the Doctors will debate, the ministers declare, that the xviij. Bokes of the olde Testament, which are in the Canon of the Hebrues, with all the Bokes of the newe Testament, be approued Canonical of the one and other parte, and they are sufficiente to decide wholy all the pointes of their Confession, and generally all that belonges to true religion, neither haue they occasion, by the meanes of that, to delay any more the conference in respect

yeete of difference betweene the two parties touching the distinction of the Canonical and Apocriphal Bookes.

Obiection.

Notwithstanding the Ministers say, their religion is founded vpon the worde of God, yet they grounde Gods worde vpon inward Reuelation, so that, Reuelation is the ground of the worde, and consequently of their religion: for they receiue for the worde, but that which they thinke to be particularely reuealed vnto them.

Touching the other Article, where they reiecte the opinion of the Doctours, that Faithe is gotten by the hearing of Goddes worde, it semes they offer to stumble vppon small blockes, as not to enter into the principall. And where they alleage that faithe is a gifte of God, and therfore not gotten, it is moste manifest by many ordinarie textes of Scripture, that it dothe not differ, one thing to be giuen and gotten: as the kingdom of heauen which is giuen to the blessed, and yet we doe get it hauing true Faithe working by charitie, the scripture also calles it the rewarde and recompence of good workes, and S. Paule saithe, that by liberalitie and almes men gaine the grace of God: Yea there can be none other vnderstanding of S. Paules speache, *Fides ex auditu*, but that Faith comes by hearing Goddes worde, which is the obteining of the same, by the meane of hearing it preached, albeit it be a gifte of God. They vse the like subtiltie in going about to rebuke the opinion, that Faithe is the truthe reuealed, as putting a great difference betweene the truthe reuealed, and the Reuelation of truthe, which subtiltie shoulde be offred against S. Paule, who sayeth: *Panis quem frangimus, nonne communicatio corporis Domini est*, which is as much, as, *panis fractio nonne &c.* And therefore, to speake properly, the text of S. Paule must needes be subiecte to suche rebukes. So that touching this Article, to the ende not to incidente notwithstanding the Replie of the Ministers, the Doctors will dispute no more of it, as being a matter to muche impertinent, seeing that in the ende, it would procure speache of merite, and so from one to another. Hebrues, 13.

It greeues them to enter vpon the vocation of the lawfull Ministers of the churche, and therefore to auoide that question, they will not alleage (which they might without any superfluous discourse) that afore their Doctrine be receiued, they muste be examined whether they were lawfull ministers sent of the true church to preach Gods worde, and to be heard of the people in their sermones, according to S. Paules place alleaged here before, which if they of the newe Religion had well considered, they might haue a moste sufficient argument not to receiue their Doctrine, bicause it is no lesse cleare than the day, that they are no Ministers sent by the Pastoures of the Churche: but haue foisted in themselues to preache, and are not able to shewe any signe of their vocation, either from men, and muche lesse from GOD: And if it were lawefull to euery one that saithe he is sent, to preache the worde, it were to raise infinite Sectes, as we see happeneth in this time, and so they cease further speeche in this Argument, least they giue a greater heate to the matter.

Touching the Article declaring howe we may knowe a Reuelation to be of God, which the ministers hold, is rather discerned by the worde, then by the consente of many, it resembles nothing the purpose of the Doctors: For the question is, howe a man may iudge a Booke to containe Goddes worde, and not to iudge the Doctrine by the worde already receiued, to which the Doctoures desire, and the Ministers make request, that directly to the pointe, they might giue their aunsweres.

Touching where they saide, of the consent of many, the Doctoures phrase was not so, but spake of the consent of the Churche, which is as infallible as Gods worde: for as it is certaine that the holy Spirite is author of the worde, so is it no lesse sure, that he is the soule of the Churche, by whose guide, she can neuer erre, according to the witnesse of S. Paule, who calles it *Columnam & firmamentum veritatis*: they will not enter into this Question, whether the multitude of the Churche may erre or not, and yet, it can not be founde

since

since the Churche was planted after the deathe of Christe, that shée hathe béene in lesse number, than the sectes of Heretikes: neither dothe it serue to this purpose that hathe bene alleaged of Constance, and of the time of the old Testament, for there is greate difference betwéene the Sinagoge of the *Iewes*, and the Churche, which as it is a congregation of all nations beleeuing in Jesus Christe: so it can not but stande and consiste in moste great multitude, for otherwayes the promises made to the Churche of the Gentiles shoulde be vaine: For it is saide to Abraham, that his séede (we must not meane of the fleshe) should be multiplied as the Starres of heauen, or sande of the Sea.

To the Article that beginnes, touching the Prophets, &c. the Doctoures say and confesse that there is great difference betwéene fantasticall imaginations, and Reuelation of the holy Spirite. But the Ministers Aunswere not, howe they woulde proue their particulare persuasions to be rather Reuelations, then vaine and fonde imaginations of Prophets, whereof Ezechiel speakes: which notwithstanding they called inspirations, as also what they saide and preached, they called it the worde of God.

To the Article which beginnes, touching Anabaptistes, &c the Doctoures Aunswer, that to one ende the Ministers and Anabaptistes produce selfe places, whereof mention is made, as the better to assure their Doctrine to be of God, bicause they haue a particulare Reuelation, as God hathe promised them by his Prophetes: For which selfe cause the Ministers haue broughte in the saide Testimonies of scripture, to proue that euery Faithfull man, may iudge by his particulare inspiration, if a Booke containe the worde of God, with Distinction of the Canonicall from the Apocriphall, and so discerne the true Doctrine from the false, which is the very grounde of the Anabaptistes and other Heretikes.

To the Article beginning, touching that which is produced of Brentius, &c, the Doctors alleage that the ministers haue not vnderstande their intent: For they bring not in the saying

ing of Brentius and Bucer, otherwayes than in a speache and meaning, that they know the Canonicall Bookes of the holy scripture by the tradition of the Churche, and not by particulare inspiration, as the Ministers doe.

Touching the Article folowing, the Doctoures say, that certaine times there were, that some men doubted of certaine Bookes of Scripture, as the Apocalips and Canonicall Epistles of S. Iohn, with others: Albeit which time, and of common consent, the Churche (led and guided by the holy Ghoste) hathe receiued indifferently for Canonicall, all the Bookes that be in the Bible, which consent continued by so many hundred yeares, had more authoritie than the saying of one or two, who notwithstanding spake not but of their owne time. Besides, there is no comparison at all, betweene the saying of one or two particulare men, and the determinations of Councels, and consent of the Church, as is saide: it will be founde also, that S. Ierome hathe approued those Bookes as Canonicall, as appeareth in the Prologue he made of the Booke of the Machabees, where he saithe: As for the Hebrues, they are not Canonicall, but, *sunt canonica Historiæ Ecclesiæ*, or suche like wordes. Touching the Councell of *Laodicen*, they take it as it is, albeit it may be they are deceiued, naming one Councel for an other. And for the Article beginning, touching the experience, &c, albeit it be a Question *de facto*, yet it can not be but of special value, which if it be founde as the Doctoures haue proponed (whereof they doubt not) the grounde of their particulare Reuelation is pluckt downe and confounded.

Touching the conclusion of the Ministers, the Doctoures declare that many times they haue cõplained, that matters were incidented: laying themselues vpon the iudgement of euery one, that their last Resolution was drawne in one direct line, handling one selfe matter, without varying, in which notwithstanding, if there had bene found any matter of difficultie, and that ỹ ministers had desired to proceede to the conference of the principal points, they could easily haue cleared the said difficultie, the Doctors wold haue enlarged

further matter, of these Articles, saving that to enforce and hasten the businesse for the whiche they are called, they forbeare to multiplie speache.

Where the Ministers alleage that they receiue the xxiiij. Bookes of the Olde Testamente, with al those of the New, the Doctors saie, that is smal respecte of matter: For al the conference whiche hitherunto they haue made, as by what Rules a man might discerne one Booke from an other, with iudgemente whether they were of Scripture or not, was to bring them to this point, that they receiued them by the tradition of the Churche, who as shee is the iudge of the number of Bookes: And that by the same meane, when was question of the vnderstanding of Goddes worde (yea in the collation of the places of the same Scripture) the Ministers & Doctors might haue such reuerence to the vniuersal church, that shee mighte be accessed on bothe partes, as iudge of the vnderstanding of Scripture, whiche they woulde acknowledge to haue receiued of her, and whereof shee is infallible, & more certaine iudge than either the one or other: Al which notwithstanding the Doctors offer to the Ministers, not to inferre for that time other Bookes than such as they receiue for Canonical: only when they shal fall into difficultie of the interpretation of any text, or the conference of many, the doctors accompte it more reasonable to haue recourse to the vniuersal Churche and Auncient Fathers, than to their proper iudgements, or fansies of the Ministers.

Aunswere.

For conclusion, the Ministers consente to the offer of the Doctors, to decide the pointes and Articles of theire confession by the Bookes Canonical agreed vpon betweene them, as the xxiiij. Bookes of the Hebrewes, and all those of the Newe Testamente, protesting notwithstanding that in the last writing proponed by the Doctors, there be many things whiche they approue not in any sorte, and whiche they hope to reuerse by Confutation when the occasion shall moue, whiche they had presently done, were not theire intente to shewe (contrary to the imputation of the Doctors) that they

will not straie, nor wander, nor vary any way from the conference of the pointes of their confession.

Replie.

The Doctours Reciprocally agrée with the Ministers to the offer aforesaid with modification to adde (for their parts) the authoritie of the vniuersall Church and ancient Doctors for the interpretation and vnderstanding of the holy Scriptures, when they differ or cannot agrée.

## The thirde day of disputation,

being Thursdaye the tenth *of July.*

THe Ministers haue shewed what be the protestations of the Doctors, as not to come to conference for other end, than to satisfie the Lady of Buillon, and not to be instructed, or informed in the pointes of the Religion they holde: And likewise howe the Ministers protested for theire partes not to conferre with them, in respecte they stoode doutful in any pointe of their confession, wherein they rested absolutely resolued: By reason of whiche protestations, they required that the first pointe of their conference might be that, which the Lady Buillon hath publikely praied to be decided: which is the Supper and the Masse, to the ende also they might be cleared of the charge of imputation laide vpon them by the Doctors, that they varied, and woulde not come to the principall pointe, whiche is the matter of the Masse, but of the contrarye, did eschewe and shunne the conference thereof.

Finally, to the ende it be knowne whiche of them flitteth from the decision of it, they offer (after that pointe be confuted) to enter conference with them, (if it so like them touching al the other pointes which remaine in cõtrouersie as leasure and time shalbe allowed them: They required

also

also (to cutte of all confusion, and suche as happened the daye before in the conference) that the Doctors would propound particularely their argumentes apart, and that aunsweres might succæde accordingly in like order by the Ministers: or els if they wil propounde their argumentes and reasons together, there shoulde be graunted vnto them a whole daie of pourpose, wherein they might wel do it without any interruption, with this condition, that the nexte day shoulde distende to the Ministers to aunswere by order to all their argumentes.

The Doctours saie, that by that which is written heretofore of the Ministers, it maie be easily knowne that they haue alwayes drawne backe, as at this present they do refuse to enter conference of things which they haue committed to cõtrouersie, marueilling greatly that this day they wil not suffer the Articles of their confession to be examined by order, as in the firste daie of conference they did require in the presence of the Lorde de Neuers, the Lorde and Lady of Buillon, with other Lordes and Gentlemenne presenting their saide confession conteined in a litle guilte Booke, with offer to the Doctoures to examine them by order, if they thoughte so good, whiche they accoumpted very reasonable: Whereupon yesterday they departed with this Couenant, that from this daie they woulde beginne to examine the Articles of the Creede, the Ministers themselues haning demaunded of the Doctours, whereupon they would entreate.

And touching their speache of the Protestation ẏ the assembly was erected for the instructiõ of the Lady, whole desire stretcheth (as they say in her absence) to be first instructed touching ẏ Masse: the said Doctors say, ẏ the Ministers haue taught the said Lady with maine voice, not onely error concerning their supper, but also in many other pointes, as they wil make manifest when the Articles of the confession by them examined, shalbe handled. So that, they desiring to instruct by order the said Lady in the catholique Religiõ, did determine to obserue the order holden of all the Fathers of

the

the Churche, that is, to reueale to her, how many errors are conteined in the Catechisme of theire Churche against the Articles of Faithe, notwithstanding that they persuade to those of theire Religion, that touching those Articles, they differ nothing from the Catholikes: wherein bicause, to instructe a personage, it is necessarie wee beginne at the fundations, and that of certaine Articles of the Crede (wherein the Ministers and their like do erre) dependes a beginning of the prowfe of the Real Presence of the Body of Christe in the Sacrament of the Alter, they stande to folowe the order of all good Scholemaisters and Teachers in discipline, and whiche the Ministers them selues observe according to the methode in theire Catechisme: And with good right, mighte the worlde smile at the Doctors (who are taken for instructers) if at the pleasure of the Ministers them selues, they woulde beginne to teache a personage by the pointe wherein they ought to end, like as the Catechisme of the Ministers dothe ende of the matter of the Supper: Besides, seeing the Ministers (by theire owne motion) are contente that all the Articles of their cõfession be examined, they haue no interest at all to make vs beginne at the firste, seeing, besides it is the consent of al order, yet, it is alwaies at the choise of the proponer to put forthe by suche order as he thinkes beste, the questions of disputations if any be: wherein, seeing they are bounde to yelde reason of their Faithe as often as they are required, it cannot be inexpedient, aswell for the benefite of the Lady, as instruction of such as shal reade the conference, to folowe this methode: whiche offer of the Doctors, if they refuse, they cannot shifte of the generall iudgemente of the worlde, that distrusting their doctrine (whiche they dare not mainteine) they confuse the conference.

Touching theire requeste, that in the conference, the Doctors should exhibite but one reason at once, to the ende they maie aunswere without confusion: or els, that in one daye the Doctors maie propone al their reasons, and in an other daie the Ministers aunswere them: The firste offer seemes reasonable to the Doctors, and they accepte it, for feare to

enter

enter into long speaches: But for the seconde, they never hearde that any suche was practised, neither is it needeful to assemble in one place for that pourpose, but sende their writings mutually one to an other.

Aunswere.

Touching, to exhibite theire confession, and their offers, whiche the Doctors suppose the Ministers haue made, they referre them to the Registers, alleaging further that it appeares by the laste proposition of the Doctors, that it is not vppon the confession whiche the Doctors saie was exhibited to them, but vpō the Catechisme, that they wil ground their disputation: For ende, the Ministers protest againe as before, to the ende it may be knowne to the multitude, who they be that refuse the lystes: requiring that the order to argue and aunswere maie runne from henceforwarde enterchangeably betweene them and the Doctors, seeing it is meete things be equall and necessarie, that the Doctoures yelde reason of theire Faithe, as wel as the Ministers.

Replie.

The Doctours referre them selues to that whiche hath bene sette downe in writing in the two firste conferences, where was continuall speache to examine the Articles of their confession, without making mention of the Masse.

And where they pretende a seeming and meaning in the Doctours to examine the Catechisme, and not the Articles of the Confession, the Doctours are contente to proceede in the saide Articles, conferring them with the Catechisme, seeing they two oughte to accorde together: And so they call all the assistantes to witnesse and iudge, by whom it standes that the conference is not begonne.

Touching the change of order whiche the ministers demaund this day, it is a late fashion, and a new trouble, seeing hitherunto they haue kept the place of respondentes, & deliuered the Articles of their confession to be examined; where ỳ Doctors were alwaies arguers, & of their side not propouned any thing to examination, & yet are they contente (after the said confession be examined) that ỳ Ministers propound

suche difficulties as they haue againste the Catholike Doctrine, whereunto, the doctors (with Gods grace) will make aunswere.

Demaunde.

Whether the Ministers beleue that the creede, called the Symbole of the Apostles, was made by the Apostles, and whether they beleue al that is conteined therein.

Aunswere.

It is a thing different, whether the Apostles them selues being together, haue written it, euery one bringing to it his sentence (as somme hold) whether it hathe bene gathered of diuers places of holy writings: yet in the reformed Church, we beleue euery point to be drawne out of the pure doctrine of the Prophetes & Apostles conteined in their writings, as if we should say (by the importaunce & contentes) that it is a summe of the doctrine whiche the Apostles preached.

Demaunde.

Leauing a part (to auoide tediusnes) whether it be a thing indifferente to a christian to beleue that a doctrine hathe ben written by the Apostles or not, so that it keepe a conformitie with ỳ matter of the holy writings, the demaund is, if al doctrine conformed to ỳ said holy writings, may take indifferently the title of the Apostles, or other authours of the scripture.

Aunswere.

We cannot faile in calling it Apostolike doctrine, but naming it the writing of the Apostles, seemes to giue a sense ỳ it was either written with their handes, or spoken of them: But be it what maye be, whersoeuer we acknowledge any doctrine taste & sauer of the spirite, wherwith the holy men of God haue benemoued, we wil cal it Prophetical and Apostolical doctrine.

Obiection.

The Demaunde stretcheth not whether the doctrine be Apostolicall in respecte of suche conformitie, but whether, by that reason it mighte be attributed to the Apostles, and of equall authoritie with the writings wherewith it is

conformed, because it proceedes of a selfe same spirite, as the aunswere saithe.

Aunsvvere.

The aunswere is already made, whiche is that such writing conteines Apostolical doctrine, & in what sense it maye be termed to be of the Apostles.

Obiection.

The aunswere (vnder correction) apperteines nothing at al to the demaunde: for the question is not, whether (for the conformitie) it maie be accompted Apostolical: But whether (in regarde of this conformitie) it maie be attributed to the Apostles, and beare the title and name of the Apostles with equal authoritie to the proper writings of the Apostles.

Aunswere.

The first demaund was, if the créde was made of the Apostles, whereunto a sufficient aunswere was made: After which it is lawfull to fashion a second demaund which differeth from that.

Obiection.

The seconde dependes vpon the first which also is made: and whether it be satisfied in aunswere or not, let the Readers discerne and iudge.

Aunswere.

To depende vpon it, is not therefore the same.

Demaunde.

Whether they approue the said Créde only, because they knowe it to be conformable to the writings of the Apostles, or whether there be any other thing that induceth them to beleue it.

Aunswere.

That not only it is conformable, but euen the doctrine it selfe: for which cause they beleue and approue it.

Demaunde.

Whether a man be not bound to receiue it, but in respect he knoweth it to be the selfe writing, or haue conformitie with the writings of the Apostles, as is saide.

Aunswere.

The chefe cause ỳ may moue him ỳ beleues it to beleue it

in déede, is the knowledge whiche we haue spoken of.

Demaunde.

Notwithstanding this be the principall cause, yet wée require to be absolutely aunswered, whether there be no other sufficient reason to induce beléefe, so that this firste maye be necessarie.

Aunswere.

Aswel for the matter of the Créde, as euery other thing which we beleue, the principall cause is the knowledge we haue, that the same hath ben left vs written or gathered out of the writings of ỳ Prophets & Apostles: And for our parts we search no other reason than that, of our Faithe.

Obiection.

Yet (vnder correction) the Demaunde is not fully aunswered: Whiche is, to knowe whether to receiue the créde of the Apostles, this cause be necessarye, to vnderstande the writings of the Apostles, and that withoute the same, no man either can or oughte receiue it: The Doctours prays to be absolutely aunswered, either in the one or the other, without circuit of wordes: And the more simplye to vnfolde and explicate the Demaunde, thus it is, whether a personne oughte not receiue the Créde of the Apostles, but vnder knowledge that it is conformed to the writings of the Apostles.

Aunswere.

Rom. 10. Hebr. 11. Séeing (with the doctrine of S. Paule) there is no true faith without knowledge, & assurance of the worde, to beleue, it is necessary we know that it is the worde of God.

Demaunde.

To knowe, whether they vnderstande this worde to be written or not written.

Aunswere.

The worde written and reuealed by the Prophetes and Apostles, whiche is the fundation of Christian Faithe.

Obiection.

The ministers then mainteine, that after the créde be beleued, or proponed to beleue, it is needefull to be taughte,

or to teache an other the writings of the Apostles and Prophets, the same being againste all order euer holden in the Churche, and against the contentes in the fourme to administer the Sacramentes in the Churche at *Geneua* made by Caluine, and brought in amongst his workes. The wordes are these: Woe to them that haue charge of the childe that is Baptized, seeing there is Question to receiue this childe into the companie of the Christian churche, you promisse, when he comes to age of discretion, to instruct him in the Doctrine receiued and approued of the people of God: And after these wordes, they bring in the Creede, according to the whiche, they are willed to proceede in the instruction of the childe, in all the Doctrine contained in the holy Scripture of the olde and newe Testament, so that afore they propone to beleeue the Creede, they persuade not to beleeue that there is any word of God written, nor what it is, nor what is there contained, as to knowe the conformitie of the Creede with the same: They lay not also the foundation of the beleefe of the Creede, vppon the knowledge and conformitie of scriptures, but vppon the doctrine receiued and approued of the people of God: as the Auncient churche, yea afore the writings of the newe Testament were written, had a custome to propone to great and small the beleefe of the Creede, afore they would commende to them the holy scriptures, as appeareth by christian Antiquities. And therfore the beleefe of a Christian, dependes not of the worde written by the Creede, but of the worde reuealed to the people and church of God.

Aunswere.

Touching the firste Article, it is moste necessary in teaching the Apostles Creede to a childe or other ignorante persone, that therewith also, he be instructed in the Doctrine of the Prophetes and Apostles, seing the Creede containes none other matter, than this selfe same Doctrine, and that they are things not onely conioyned, but also like, if not in termes, at least in sense and substance.

For the second Article, they denie that that which is alleaged before, is any way contrary to the order established

in the churche of *Geneua*, or other church well directed: wherin touching the reason taken of the fourme of Baptisme vsed in the saide churches, it foloweth not by the wordes and speaches which haue bene alleaged, that Caluine woulde shut oute the Crede, and seperate it from the writings and Doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles (a thing impossible) but sheweth euidently that he ment to comprehende it therein, when he added this worde, and generally (which the Doctoures haue put in their Allegation) to comprehende what mighte be ouer and abous the holy Scriptures, after the deduction which he made of the points of the Doctrine comprehended particularely in the saide Crede. Touching the other reason that afore there were any Booke of the newe Testament written, ỳ Crede was proponed to such as were Catechised: it is agreed vnto: But it folowes not for al that, that it is not founded vppon the worde and Doctrine which the Apostles preached (albeit at that time it was not set downe in wryting) and likewise vppon the wrytings of the Prophetes, vppon which the Doctrine of the Apostles is grounded: For Conclusion, the Ministers putte no difference betweene Godes worde preached and written, touching the sense.

Obiection.

It semes the Ministers haue not well vnderstande the meaning of the Doctoures: For there is no Question, to knowe whether the Crede carie conformitie of hymselfe with the Apostolike writings, but whether firste we muste vnderstande and beleeue that the Apostles and Prophetes, haue set downe by wryting, a Doctrine, wherewith the sayd Crede dothe conforme: and that other wayes a man can not beleeue the saide Crede: But to vnfolde it more easily, the Question is, if it be not possible that a childe, being come to the age of discretion, or any other, may by instructions of the Parentes, or others, beleeue the Articles contained in the Crede, and be not firste instructed by them, that there be certaine Apostolike writings, whereunto the Articles of the Crede may be conformed. And if it be necessary, to moue

him

him to beleeue it, to knowe this conformitie: And to these let the Ministers aunswer absolutely.

Aunswere.

Faithe is by hearing, and hearing by the worde of God, according to the consent of Iesus Christe, who putting the hearing of the worde afore the Faithe of the same, saythe: Who heares my word, and beleeues him that hath sent me. Rom.10. Iohn.24. etc. Like as also he commaunded the Apostles to preache first the Gospell, to the ende the hearers, by the preaching, might be disposed and led to Faithe. By these reasones, to knowe whether the Doctrine that is taughte, be the worde of God, it is necessary to beleeue, without the which also it is impossible, that a man may either haue Faithe, or beleeue in God, onlesse he be assured that that which is taught him, is Gods worde: And for the Question, touching the instruction of children at the age of discretion, or others, whether it be necessary they knowe the worde, afore they beleeue, the Aunswere is that it is needefull: And Thomas sayeth, that the Faithe of the Articles of the Creede ought to be explicated, that is, declared, which can not be done without knowledge of the worde.

Obiection.

This Aunswere containes frothe of speache, without any touche of the peinte proponed. For there is no doubte that children and others muste not be Catechised, and the Articles of the Faithe unfolded to them, by the worde of God: But the Question is, to knowe, if it be necessary they understande that thys worde be written in the Bookes of the Prophetes and Apostles, so as, wythoute the knowledge of the sayde writings, they can not knowe nor beleeue the Articles of Faithe contained in the sayde Creede.

Whereunto the Doctoures pray the Ministers to Aunswere directly either yea or no. And after the aunswere, to adde suche reason as they will: which if they will not doe, the Doctoures are of minde to procede to an Article,

after they haue tolde them, notwithstanding for conclusion of all, that if this knowledge of the scriptures were necessary to the vnderstanding of the Articles of the Creede, examining them according to the conformitie of the same Scriptures, that it behoueth (seeing the foundation is so necessary) amõgst the Articles of the Creede to put this: I beleeue there be holy scriptures: and it is to note, that in the said Symbole there is no mention made, that there is holy Scripture, so that a mã may be a true christian, afore he vnderstand there is any christian Doctrine or worde of God written, & therefore not necessary (for the beleefe and vnderstanding of the Creede) to know the worde of God to be written, in which respect the Doctors protest to speake no more of this Article.

Aunswere.

By collation and view of the Demaundes and Answers, it is easie to iudge, who offende moste in circumstaunce of wordes, either the proponentes or respondentes: Touching the second Article, the Answere is as before, that the knowledge of Gods word is necessary to beleeue, and to be a christian, whether it be written or reuealed. Touching the declaration that was made, the Ministers Answere in their owne respecte, not to approue in any sort, that any thing be added to the pure worde of God: And they beleeue the Symbol of the Apostles, to be no other thing, than the pure word of God, which is proposed to vs by his spirite, and therefore it should be a contrauention againste his commaundement, to adde newe Articles to it, maintaining also, that if there had bene others necessary to saluation, the spirite of God had not bene forgetful. For cõclusion, albeit there is no expresse mention of holy Scripture made in the Creede, yet couertly, it is vnderstande therein, bicause the churche (which can not subsist, that it is not founded and builded vpon the grounds of the Prophets and Apostles) is proponed there as an Article to beleeue.

Replie.

This Answere the Doctors say, is impertinent, and no more to purpose than the former: And albeit the Prophetes

and

and Apostles had not written at al, the church notwithstanding had bene grounded vpon their foundation, as it was in the time of Abraham, and afore there were any Scripture, which if it had bene necessary to saluation, it had bene put among the Articles of Faithe.

Aunsvvere.

The Ministers holde this Replie muche more impertinent: and touching the reason that is added, that Faithe was in the time of Abraham, albeit there was no worde written, they accorde to it: But this is euil inferred, there is no worde written, then there is no worde at all: And it is a *fallax* in argument, which the Dialecticians name *a Dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*: from a saying modified, to that is simplie saide.

# The fourth day of disputation,

being Friday the tvvelfth of *Julie.*

THe Ministers auouche to cleaue alwaies to their former request, obseruing the Protestations aforesaide made by the Doctoures, who haue twise declared, that they assembled not but to satisfie the Lord of Montpensier, and the Ladie Buillon, according also to whose request, publikely made in the company, to be instructed vpon the point of the Supper, and not in other matters, wherein shee accompts her selfe sufficiently taught, and hath no neede of more ample instruction: and therefore, the saide Ministers require as afore, that the first pointe which they should conferre vpon, might be the supper and the masse, the rather for that they vnderstood by people worthy of faith and credite, that the Doctoures meant nothing lesse, than to enter disputation vpon that grounde.

Hereupon the Doctoures say they are ashamed to heare so often Protestacions, and that the Ministers seeme to feede

with suche fashions, of purpose to eschue conference in the Articles of their Confession, which (notwithstanding) they haue oftentimes offered to be examined.

And where they alleage that the Ladie of Buillon, (for whose instruction the companie is assembled) hathe openly required to be instructed vppon the Article of the Masse, and not otherwayes: They Answere, that shee put out a motion to procure conference of the Masse, but they neuer heard that shee helde hir selfe sufficiently instructed touching the other Articles. If the Duchesse will confesse ý shee beleeues all the other Articles proponed by the Ministers and their likes against the doctrine of the Catholike church, to be erronious, they are ready from the present, to enter into conference of the Masse: But of the contrary, if shee be imbrued with the erroures impugning the doctrine of the Catholike church (in respect to vse order appertaining to instructoures, and to lay the foundations of the Masse) the Doctours are determined, according to the good and holy desire of the Lorde of Montpensier, to Catechise and teache the Lady his Daughter euery Article, and by order: They say further, that the Ministers are infected with the custome of those of their Church, which is that to eschue alwayes conference with the Catholikes, afore the decision of the poynt proponed, they thrust an other into disputation according to the example of Beza and other ministers that were with him at Poyssi, who, seeing the matter of the Supper was argued against them in the Priours chamber at Poissi, in the presence of the Quéne, Princes of the bloud, and other Lordes of the Councell, made Request many times to let fall that point indecided, and enter vppon others more euident and manifest againste the Catholikes, as of Images and other like: And of the contrary, the Ministers this day, to auoide the great erroures in their interpretation of the Créde, will fonde in the pointe of the Supper: onely the Doctoures beseche as before, that (confusion auoided) Religion may be examined by order: And leaste it be thought, that the Doctoures refuse to enter conference of the Masse and Supper, according to their constante meaning as

in

in déede (vnder generall correction) they neuer denied to dispute of them: the better to instructe the Duchesse and with more spéede, they are readie to dispute with open voice, and euident Declaration by the expresse worde of God, that Iesus Christe hath instituted and saide the Masse, and his Apostles also: They offer also, that what so euer shall be deliuered by voice and spéeche touching this matter, to be sette downe in wryting the next dayes after, and put in order, as the instruction of the Duchesse requires it: Referring themselues for the day, to the opportunitie of the Ladie: Heere the Ministers made Answere, that all these offers were superfluous and vnprofitable, because suche conferences, are but debates and alterations, offending and slaundering more than they edifie.

*Resolution of the Doctours.*

THe Doctors, according to the order already begon, and their charge, which is to conferre with the Ministers, and then yelde Resolution for the instruction of the Duchesse of Buillon, Touching the two pointes proponed yesterday (whether the Apostles be Authoures of the Créede, and why we ought to giue Faithe thereunto) say it ought not to be estéemed a thing indifferent, to knowe if the Apostles made and erected the Créede, no more than to know if the Apostles be the Authors of their wrytings: For as their Authoritie is farre greater in the assuraunce that they procéede certainely from the Apostles, euen so of the contrary, it should be lesse by many degrées, if we either doubted of it, or vsed it as indifferent: They say further it is no sufficient reason, to cal this Créede Apostolicall, and to Christen it by the name of the Apostles, in respecte of the conformitie it hath with their wrytings, séeing that by the same reason, other Simbols (as that of Niceus, Athanasius & suche other like wrytings, may beare also the name of the apostles Créede, as containing a doctrine agréeing wᵗʰ the wrytings of ẏ Apostles: and therfore the Doctors say we must beléeue ẏ the Apostles haue made & deliuered to Christians this Créede, and applie faith to it, as being

a wryting composed by the Apostles, for proofe whereof, they haue the authoritie of all times, since the Apostles till now, that this Creede hath bene proponed in Baptisme and Catechisme, as appeareth by the Authors which haue bene from the Apostles til our time: neither can we name or note any Author or Councell which hathe made this Creede, that afore the same Author or Councel (euen vntill we come immediatly to the Apostles) this Simboll hath not bene proponed in Baptisme and Catechisme, and called amongste Christians the rule of Faithe: which our such argument, S Augustine in many places against the Donatistes, esteemes inuincible, to proue that something there is of the Apostles: Omitting willingly (for wearinesse sake) other Auncientes who acknowledged this Creede to be made and receyued namely of the saide Apostles, as S. Ambrose, S. Ierome and others.

Touching the second pointe, the Doctoures say that the bonde and necessitie to beleeue this Simboll, dependes not of the knowledge of the Apostolicall or Propheticall wrytings, nor of the knowledge of their conformitie with them, for it was made and contained amongst Christians in Baptisme, afore there were any Apostolicall wryting, and in Baptisme, it was proposed to beleeue the saide Creede, afore there was entrie into the wrytings or speache therof: in the primitiue Churche, wrytings were eramined, whether they were to be receiued or not, and the vnderstanding of the same, together if a Doctrine were true or false, by this Simboll and rule of Faithe, and to imitate or confront it with it, as Irenæus, Tertullian and others affirme.

And though it should happen, that a man neuer heard but the Simboll, without knowing whether there were holy Scriptures or not, yet he might beleeue the said Creede, and be a true Christian, so that he were not infected with other particulare false opinions. And of the contrarie, if the beleefe of the Creede depended vppon the knoweledge of the Prophetical or Apostolicall wrytings, as to vnderstand

and

and be assured of the conformitie that therein is, afore we beleue it: onely wise men, and such as were wel studied in writinges (who woulde assure them selues of the saide conformitie) should be bounde to beleue the Symboll, or at the leaste, assured of the truthe of the same, and so there shoulde be fewe Christians: Therefore the beleefe of the Creede dependes not vpon the knowledge of the Scriptures.

By meane whereof the Doctoures holde by tradition of the Churche gouerned by the holy spirite, that the Creede is of the Apostles, and that there is no doubte thereof. In like sorte by the same tradition we muste geue Faithe to it, as a Doctrine of the Apostles not written, and yet of equall authoritie with that whiche is in their writings, notwithstanding we had no knowledge of other Scriptures. The Doctoures are very sory, that the other parte hath so muche declined to aunswere pertinently and absolutely to these two pointes, why they proponed onely to shewe what Faithe and authoritie men oughte to attribute to this Symbol, and all other Doctrine receiued by Tradition of the Apostles (without Canonical writing) whiche might haue bene lefte by them by the same meane and reason, that is shewed that the Symboll was geuen to the Christians by the said Apostles, without that they put it in writing.

For ende, the Doctours persuade suche as shal reade this conference, not to amaze or maruel at so many perplexities, declining from the true ende of the said two pointes proponed, with requeste to remember the conferences of S. Augustine with the Donatistes, and Pelagians, whose fashion resembles the presente manner of the Ministers with whom they conferre, laying them selues notwithstanding vpon the iudgemente of suche as shal reade the matter of this disputation.

*Resolution of the Ministers.*

WHo affirme, according to ỹ former propositions alwaies mẽtioned by them, & also ỹ better to confirme

the faithe of the Duches, that (as S. Cyprian writeth) it is incertaine whether the Symbol which beares the name of the Apostles was made & composed suche one by them, or els drawne and gathered of their Doctrine: and also why it is called Symbolum, whether it be by reason that euery one of them broughte his parte and portion to it, or that it is a marke or certaine signe of Christian Religion: as touching whiche Regardes, it is a thing indifferente for Saluation, as hauing alwayes one equall weighte and authoritie, whether the Apostles write it, or whether it was faithfully gathered of their writings, as were also the Symbols aswel of Niceus, as of Athanasius, of whom the Church neuer doubted, that they conteined not a pure Apostolicall Doctrine, as she hathe well and euidently declared, in ordeining that the saide Symboll of Nyceus shoulde be openlye published to the people when they assembled for the Communion, the same being in obseruation at this day in the Churche of Rome, where this Symboll is readde and sunge euery Sonday in the Temples, whiche if it conteined not Apostolicall Doctrine, it shoulde impugne the 59. Articles of the Councell of *Laodicene*, by whiche it is forbidden to reade in the Churche, any thing of Priuate inuention, but onely the Doctrine comprehended in the Canonicall Bookes of the Olde and Newe Testament whose number is there made.

The Ministers do further affirme, that the reason and principall cause of the Faithe, which Christians adde to this Creed, is the knowledge they haue, that it is ỳ pure word of God, and he that teacheth it, mainteines also that it is Gods worde, the same appearing by the testimony and writing of S. Paule, who, after he hath proponed to the Corinthians the Deathe, Buriall, and Resurrection of Iesus Christe, whiche be the principall Articles of the Crede, as vpon whiche also our iustification is chiefely founded: Addeth this speache, that he hathe geuen them that whiche he hathe receiued, whiche is, that Christe is deade for our sinnes according to the Scriptures: and after that he was buried,

and

and is risen againe the thirde daye, according to the Scriptures.

Christe him selfe also, proposing in like sorte his Deathe, Luk. 24.
and Resurrection to his two Disciples, alleageth to them the Scriptures for their more assurance, saying: Oh fonde & weake of hart to beleue all things that the Prophets haue pronounced: was it not meete ỳ Christ suffred these things, and that he entred into his glorie: then beginning at Moyses and the other Prophetes, he declared to them in all the scriptures the things that were of him selfe. In the same chapter, appearing to them after his Resurrectiõ, yea afore the crede was made, speaking to them of his death and resurrection, for their better assuraunce, he laies vnto them the scriptures, saying, It is so written, and it was meete that Christ suffred and rise from death the third day, by which wee maie inferre, that for the grounde of Faithe, and assurance of the Articles of the same, there is no better meane than to propone the Scriptures.

And albeit in the tyme of the Natiuitie of the Churche, the Crede was proponed to suche as were Catechised, afore the Apostles or Euangelistes had sette downe any thing in writing, yet it foloweth not for all that, that there were not other scriptures vppon which might be founded euery Article of Faithe: Whiche to decypher by peecemeale, the Article of Creation hathe his fundation vppon the beginning of Genesis: The Article of the Almightinesse of God hathe his grounde vppon the 40. of Esaie, and many other places of scripture.

The Article of the Conception of Jesus Christe, vppon the vij. of Esay: For the place of his Natiuitie, vppon the v. of Micheas, and for the Regarde of the Time, vppon the xlix. of Genesis, and ix. of Daniel: The Article of his death & the Crosse, vpon the xxij. Psalme: xxxv. of Esay, and ix. of Daniel: The Article of Resurrection, vppon the xvj. Psalme: the Article of Ascension, vppon the cxviij. Psalme: the Article of the Judgemente, in Daniel vij. the Article of his sending the holy ghost, in Ioel ij. the Article of ỳ Church

in

in Esay 2. and Micheas 4. the Article of Remission of sinnes in the Psalme 32. and 37. of Ezechiel, and the Article of the Resurrection of the flesh, and eternall life in Daniel 12.

It maie appeare to euery one by the places here inferred, that there were cleare and euidente Scriptures, to grounde all the Articles of Faithe, afore the Crede was bestowed in writing, whiche might and oughte to be exhibited to suche as were Catechised, for their assurance in that which was proposed them to beleue: Neither is it possible that a man may beleue, if first he haue not vnderstand and hearde the word, and that he assure hime self of it, and holdit as certaine (and more if it were possible) than the matters conceiued, and comprehended by Mathematicall demonstrations, as appeareth by the definition of the Faith, when the Apostles calles it Hypostasin and Eleuchon, whiche is, substance of things whiche we see not. The Ministers also saie, that to call the Crede a Doctrine not written, and in the meane while affirme that the Apostles wrote it, is to implie contradiction: Neither can it be shewed howe longe it hath bene a doctrine not written, nor since when it hath begonne to be written: And greatly do the Ministers greue, that they who conferre with them, do not more laboure in the edifying aswell of such as assiste the conference, as others to whose viewe and reading the actes may come. For where they might handle and decide pointes tending to edifie the ignorante, they staie vpon the question of others wherein is no doubt at al: The same bring no more than to proue a thing already confessed and resolued, and lighte a Candle at noone dayes. They assure them selues, that suche as shall reade the actes of this conference, wil not maruel to see them decline from the point wherein they haue bene so much required, bicause (as Christ saithe) He that doth be euil, fleeth the lighte.

Hebr 12.

For conclusion, the Ministers protest to confesse and beleue, that the Symbol of the Apostles in euery Article is the pure worde of God, and that in the faithe of the same it behoueth euery faithefull man to stande and persener vntill the ende: So that for their partes, they will in no sorte re-

ceiue or approue in their Churches any that denieth, or is doubtful of the saide Articles.

Replie.

The Doctours wil proue, that the Doctrine of the Ministers conteineth pointes, contrary to the principall Articles of the Creede: As firste, against the Article of Goddes Omnipotencie, when they say and teach that God cannot make that one Body be in two places: The seconde against the Article of Creation, wherein they saie, that not onely God suffereth that euill and sinne be committed, but also dothe it him selfe: The thirde, sometimes they denie, and earst confesse for an Article of Faithe, that the Virgyn Mary should remaine a Virgyn after her deliuery: The fourthe, that Iesus Christe is not descended into Hell but by imagination, and not Really: Yea moreouer, against the saide Article they saie, that Iesus Christe dispaired of his saluation (vpon the tree of the Crosse) as being troubled in his conscience with feare to be damned: with many other errours conteined in this Article. Vpon whiche obiections they aduertise the Ministers that they stande ready to aunswere them.

## The fifthe day of disputation,

being the fiuetenth of Iuly,
*and Munday.*

The Ministers haue required their requeste before made, and now eftsoones reiterated, for the spedie entry of the Doctoures into conference touching the pointes of the Masse) to be inregistred: to the ende the occasion may be knowne why the Doctours delaie and refuse the saide conference.

The Doctours not willing to lese time, and mindefull withal to folowe the accorde made in the last day of disputa-

tion, according to the whiche, the Ministers ought to answere touching the errors contained in ỳ doctrine preached by them, against the Articles of the crede, as the Doctours haue noted and proposed them, & to enter immediately into the matter, they affirme, that the Ministers haue cuill alleaged S. Cyprian, as to denie that the Crede was of the Apostles: For S. Cyprian doubtes not at all, neither puttes in doubte, as indifferente, whether it be of the Apostles or not, but saithe expressely that afore they departed from together, they made the saide Crede, as appeareth in the Preface of his Exposition. Further the Doctoures demaund vpon the Article of the Omnipotencie (whiche is the fundation of the Supper and the Sacramente) why in a confession proponed at Poisie before the King by Beza, and after him other Ministers, and bestowed in diuerse Bookes, is not conteined the article of the Omnipotencie, which is the firste and principall Article of Faithe, and why they haue made so many different confessions of Faithe, taking awaye that they haue putte in the one, and (of the contrarye) adding what they haue omitted in the others: And howe this Article of the Trinitie is not expressely in the firste confession, 1564. which they confesse, albeit moste darkely.

Aunswere.

It appeares by the actes of the laste dayes conference, that the demaunde of the Ministers was in nature the selfe Requeste they presently make, whiche is, that the pointe of the Masse might be firste decided, as being the chiefe occasion of the conference.

And for that they propone touching the Symboll, the Ministers neuer doubted, nor yet suspecte, but that it is a pure Apostolicall Doctrine, whiche lies to all mennes view in reading the actes of the saide dayes Disputation, where, in halfe a dosen places at the leaste, they haue alwayes confessed & repeated the same: The only thing, they mainteined to be in dout, is, whether the Crede was written by the Apostles or not, wherein thei can nothing be verefied, nor appeare by the Doctors: and S. Cyprian him selfe whom the doctours

tours produce, giues aduertisemente to the Readers in his Preface, of the greate varietie that is in the saide Crede, because diuerse Churches haue added thereunto sundrie Articles. He aduertiseth besides, that in his Explication he followeth the order of the Churche of Aquila, and expounding also the Article of Descension into Hel (whereof the doctors make so great brute) he saithe expressely that it is not in the Symboll of the Romaine Churche, nor of the Churches of the Easte, whereof may be gathered the incertaintie of that whiche is touched before, and that there is no Article wherein we maye reasonably doubte, if it be of those whiche the Apostles haue written, or added by somme Churches, or els wee muste saie the Apostles haue written diuerse Credes.

Touching the differences whiche the Doctours pretende to be in the confessions of the reformed Churches, imprinted and published in diuerse Temples, the Ministers denie to differ one from an other in respect of the sense, albeit perhaps some tearmes maie be changed for a more large declaration: and where they allege that in some of them the article of Gods almightinesse hathe bene omitted, the Ministers denie it, requiring the Doctours to produce the exemplarye of the confession, wherein they saie it is omitted, seeing if it should be so it might be falsified & corrupted: They say that in their confession there is nothing either ambiguous or darke, which some of ỳ saide Doctors haue wel shewed, whē they haue dressed a forme of confession vpon the Patron of those of the reformed Churches, vsing proper termes and sentences: whereunto they haue added nothing to make it diuerse, but that which they haue in difference with the Ministers & that they could hardly grounde vpon the scripture.

Obiection.

The Doctours say, the Ministers conceale no whit their boldnesse to deny things that are manifest, as the opinion of S. Cyprian that the Apostles were the Authoures, yea, and made and composed the Symboll, referring them selues altogether to the present hearers, and others by whom this

writing shalbe readde: wherein for their better grounde of this denial, they rest vpon a very small reason, which is vppon the Article of descending into Hell, whether it was brought in by ẏ Apostles, or added by others, as from thence to call againe into doubte, whether they be Authours of all the other Articles: The same resembling as if it were said, that it is incertaine, whether S. Iohn made his Gospell, bicause some men doubte whether the Historie of the adulterer be of him: But leauing that aparte, the Doctoures demaunde if they confesse not in their Doctrine, that God of his Omnipotencie cannot bring to passe that one body be in two places: two bodies in one place: Thirdly, that God cannot bring to passe that one body be inuisible: and fourthly, that a body may be in one place, without holding place equal to his greatenesse. Iohn, 8.

Aunswere.

All these questions are impertinent, & estranged from the confession of the churches, & yet the doctors haue chosen it for the fundation of al the conference, in which respecte, the Ministers require pertinent disputation, & that they chuse one Article or more of the said confession, vpon which they pretende to pitche the ground of the saide Confession.

Obiection.

These questions are very pertinent to impugne the Artícles of the Ministers confession: for there is no question of the proper wordes contained in the same confession, which is no other thing than a summe of the Faithe: But the Doctours seeme to impugne the sense of the articles which they knowe by theire proper writings, by whiche they make open the testimonie, that touching the Article of the Omnipotencie God cannot bring to passe the things aforesaide: The Doctoures also shewe, that it is directely to impugne the Doctrine of Heretikes, and the true meane to proue against them, that they receiue not the holy Scripture when it is proued, they comprehend not the true sense of it: They also

also say that euen the Ministers themselues be the causes of suche Questions, hauing desired to conferre of the Masse, by which meane the Doctoures woulde make them come to it: For the Article of the omnipotencie, is the principall ground to proue and sustaine Gods worde, and the Reall presence of the body of Iesus Christe in the Sacrament of the Aultare, maruelling much of much declining, considering that when there is spæche of their Confession they demaund the Masse, and when the Masse is offred, they require their Confession.

Aunswere.

The ministers maruell muche of so muche superfluous matter proponed by the Doctoures: And where they say that albeit they impugne not the termes of the saide Confession, yet they resiste the sense, the ministers Aunswere that the sense can not be knowne but by the termes, by which reason they wrap themselues in a contradiction, when in leauing the termes, they say they will confute the sense: Touching the Conclusion, affirming that one body at one selfe instante may be in diuers places, the Ministers denie in good consequence, that that can not be inferred of the omnipotencie of God.

Obiection.

The Doctoures say that it foloweth, that God can not bring to passe that at one time one body occupie two places, God then is not almightie.

Aunswere.

The Ministers denie the consequence aforesaide, and alleage the reason, as that it appeares by the holy Scripture, that God can not denie him selfe, as also it is impossible that he can lie, and yet it were blasphemie to inferre thereupon, that he is not omnipotent: For the almightinesse of God ought to be measured according to his wil, and things which are conuenient to his nature, as the Maister of sentences teacheth, saying: that God is almightie in that, that his habilitie is of power and not of infirmitie, which, S. Ierome writing to Eustachius, confirmes by this that foloweth: I will say hardly, albeit God can doe all things, yet can he not raise

1. Timo. 2
Hebr. 6.

or rá ſtablithe a Virgine after hir fall. S Auguſtine in like ſorte in the fifthe Booke of the Citie of God. Chap 10. vſeth theſe wordes: Goddes power is in nothing leſſened, when it is ſaide he can not die, nor be deceiued. And a little after, God is almighty, becauſe there be things which he can not doe: The ſame Author in the 26. of the ſame worke. Chap. 8. vſeth this ſpeeche, he that ſaith, if God be almighty, let him bring to paſſe that things which are made, be not made, doth not meane, that it is as much as if he ſhould ſay, if he be omnipotent, let him bring to paſſe that the things that are true (in as muche as they are already true) be falſe: Theodoretus alſo in his thirde Dialogue conformable to this, ſaithe: wee muſte not without Determination ſay generally, that all things are poſſible to God, becauſe he that ſaith ſo abſolutely, comprehendes things that are good, and wicked matters alſo, which be their contraries.

And a little after, he affirmes that God can not ſinne, as being a thing farre from his nature: And ſo concludes, that albeit there be many things which he can not doe (ſeeing there be many ſinnes) that yet for all that he forbeares not to be omnipotent.

Obiection.

The Doctors finde in the reaſons aforeſaid a Confeſſion of the antecedēt, which ſhuld ſeeme to be only ſuppoſed, God could not bring to paſſe that one body at one ſeaſon ſhoulde be in two places, no more than he is able to do the things by them alleaged: for they alleage them to this ende, to ſhewe that there be ſomethings which God can not do, which they can not applie to the preſent Queſtion (that one bodie can not vſe two places) without Declaration ỳ it is impoſſible to God. And touching the reaſons recited of the holy Scripture, that God can not lie nor denie himſelfe, thoſe places (vnder correction) ſerue nothing to purpoſe: For as they haue alleaged out of the Maiſter of ſentences, to lie, and to be able to ſinne, is not power, but impower, ſo of the contrary, if God could ſinne, he ſhould be impuiſſant and weake, neither coulde God do ſo, for then he ſhoulde reſiſte and de-

ſtroy

stroy him selfe.

And touching the Examples drawne out of S. Ierome and S. Augustine, that God coulde not bring to passe, that a corrupte Virgine shoulde remaine a Virgine, and that a thing done, shuld not be done, that being understand as the Theologians say, *in sensu composito*, (which is, the things being suche and so done) it is true: and the reason is, that otherwise it woulde implie contradiction. But in the Question proposed, there is nothing like, which only Demaundes, if God by his power can alter and chaunge the Nature and qualitie of things created: as if he could bring to passe, that a heauie thing abiding in his qualitie of heauinesse & waighte (which naturally weighes downeward) shoulde remaine by the onely vertue of God, hanging on high, as we reade in the holy Scripture, that the fire which naturally ascendes and stretches on heigthe, discendes downeward by the vertue of God, and also that fire of his proper nature ardente and burning, makes cold (his owne qualitie that is the heat) reasting in the substance: as also that two bodyes may be in one place, as appeareth when our Lord entred where the Apostles were, the dores being shut: or that a great and large bodie remaining in his grosenesse and bignesse, passeth thorow a place inequall to his greatnesse and largenesse as the Camell thorow the eie of a needell. All which Examples, as they are taken of the scripture, so if it muste be that God can not bring to passe that one body be in two places, he can no more doe the things aforesaide, by the reasons which shall be deduced hereafter to that ende. And as it wil neuer be found to enter into the brain of an interpreter to denie such power, so the first that hath denied it openly, was Peter Martyr, and after him Beza.

The Doctoures say further, that the fourme of arguing which the Ministers vse, impugnes and reuerseth ỳ which God obserueth in the holy scripture, and the Angel speaking to the virgin: for God ordinarily when he assureth any thing impossible to nature, & that men cannot cõprehend, alleageth generally his power: like as also ỳ Angel laying a foũdation

of

of the Incarnation of our Lord, saith generally there is nothing impossible to God, as touching his creatures: But is it so that the generalitie of an argument is deserued, by particular exceptions, and made vnprofitable and without force by that meane: When God then alleageth generally, that his power can doe it, it may be doubted of, and thought that ỹ things proponed of God, may be of these that are impossible to him: as wel as the exceptions alleaged of the ministers: And that also should be false which the Aungell saithe, that there is nothing impossible to god, by that, that many things are alleaged and proponed to the contrarie: So that to the ende God and his Aungelles, be mainteined true in their wordes, we muste not doubte that he can not chaunge and transforme his creatures and al their qualities muche more easily, than a potter is able to worke his clay, and fourme at his pleasure any vessell thereof.

Further, if we limite the power of God towards his creatures, there is daunger, that we fal not to deny him his Empire and dominion ouer them: for to be Lord ouer a creature, is no other thing than to haue power to chaunge and alter him, and giue him suche a nature and qualitie, as he thinkes good, as hauing him altogether in his power: And therefore God in Ieremie, to shewe that he had power to reuerse and destroy *Ierusalem* (according to his pleasure) begins to say, I am Lorde ouer all flesshe, is there any thing impossible to me: and therfore the Doctoures conclude, that there is daunger if this question be mainteined as impossible to God, that euery one will doe as muche: alleaging the selfe examples that the ministers do, to exempt from Gods power al things that displease him. And when suche matter shall be produced out of Scripture, he may interprete the Scripture in other sense, saying: that suche a thing shalbe impossible to God in the naturall sense of the wordes of the Scripture, euen as the ministers chaunge the Scripture, which saithe that the body of Iesus Christe is in two places, that is, the worde of the Supper compared with the worde of the Ascention, and they say, that that speeche of the Supper oughte not to be vnderstan-

derstanded literally, bicause it is impossible to God that one Body be in two places: And so the Doctours saie, that euery one woulde corrupte the Literall sense of the Scripture, holding that the thing is impossible to God, and therefore the Scripture muste be otherwayes vnderstande: and yet it maye so happen, that it is only bicause it doth displease him, producing notwithstanding the same reasons and allegations whiche the Ministers do to declare that all things are not impossible to God.

The Doctors conclude ekesones, that it is better to mainteine the Scripture in his truthe, albeit thee propose things incomprehensible and impossible to our iudgement, than to giue way to euery one to depraue Goddes worde, applying it to his owne will and fansie, vnder shadowe to saie, that it is impossible to God, and so to alleage other examples.

Lastely they will not omitte, that the Ministers, who haue so depely protested to rest & stay vpon the pure word of God, allege not against Gods power but the ancient doctours, aiding themselues with their authorities against the expresse word of God, which beares, that nothing is impossible to him generally without some exception.

Aunswere.

The Ministers aunswere that the Doctoures proue not their consequence, but leaue it as in a distruste not to be able to confirme it, as is moste likely: They make no mention but of the Antecedent of their consequence, to the confeition of whiche it will neuer be possible to them to bring the Ministers by the reasons and authorities by them alleaged to strengthen theire saide consequence, bicause of a Particulare they inferre a Generall, whiche is againste the Rules of Dialectice: where they saye, that the authorities alleaged by the Ministers, appertaine nothing to reproue their consequence, and to shewe that God forbeares not to be almighty, notwithstanding that he cannot do any thing which derogates his nature: They referre themselues for that, to the ancient authours aforesaid, who for the same end & reason of the ministers alleage the saide exceptions.

Where they pretende that the Authorities and Sentences alleaged of the Auncientes, doo nothing apperteine to the presente question, as denying that they oughte to be understand of other things, excepte suche as conteine in themselues contradiction. The Ministers aunswere, that euen so dothe that whiche they propone of a Body that in one instante he maye be in diuerse places: the same being asmuch as if they had saide, that a Bodye is, and is not at one time, and that a Body is one, and not one.

And lastely that a Creature maye be incircumscript, and not enclosed in certaine limittes: whiche if it were so, he shoulde be no more a Creature, but a God, as maye be gathered of the saying of S. Basile in his Booke of the Holye Ghoste, Chapter 22. whose opinion is, that the Aungell whiche appeared to Cornelius was not in the selfe place where Philip was, and he whiche of the Aultare spake to Zacharie, did not furnishe at the same time he spake to him, his Seate and place in Heauen: But the Holy Ghoste is in Abacuc, and Daniell in Babylon, and in Ezechiell vppon the Floudde of Chobar, for the Spirite of God repleniseth the Earthe: wherein the Prophete crying, saithe, Whither shall I goe to hide me from thy Spirite? where shall I flee to decline from thy face?

And Dydimus confirming this in his Booke whiche he hathe written of the Holy Ghoste, makes this question, If, saithe he, the Spirite of God were a Creature, he shoulde haue his substaunce circumscripte and limited, as haue all other Creatures whiche are made and created: So that, as it is that Goddes Spirite replenishes the worlde, and is not circumscripte in any place, nor lymited, so it followeth thereupon that he is God.

Vigilius in his Disputation whiche he wrote betweene Sabellius, Photius, Arius, and Athanasius, vnder the personne of Athanasius, writes in this sorte: By this it maye chiefely appeare, that the Spirite of God, is God, that he is euery where, and not conteined in any place, as the Prophete writes, whither maye I withdrawe my selfe to hide

me

me from thy Spirite?

By these places we maye conclude, that if a Bodye be not circumscripte, termined, and closed within certaine lymittes, he coulde not be a Creature, whiche ought not only to be vnderstande by other Bodyes, but also euen by Iesus Christe: as appeareth by Theodorete in his seconde Dialogue, saying, then the Body of the Lorde is risen againe, exempte from all corruption, impassible and immortal, decked with Diuine glorie, adored & worshipped with the Celestial powers. And yet albeit he be in this sort qualified, he leaues not for all that to be circumscript, as he was afore he was glorified, whereof it foloweth, that being true Body & Creature, he cannot at one instante be in sundry places.

Touching their allegations, that the examples aforesaide apperteine nothing to the questiō proponed, bicause it stretcheth not but to know if God may change the qualities into a Substance, the substance remaining: The Ministers deny it, bicause in the Question there is mention of a Bodye, whiche cannot be without his Measures: And the measures and Dimensions be not as Qualities and Accidentes, which may come to a Body and departe from it, without that it be corrupted (which is the nature & condition of Accidents) but they are of their proper Essence, so that it is impossible that a Body be a Body, but that he be measured & circumscripte.

The first example they produce to confirme their saying, is, that it may happē, that a weighty thing, which naturally in respect of his heauinesse enclines downward, may be raised on high, wherunto the Ministers answere, that the same may be in dede by a violēt mouing: but this example is nothing pertinent to reuerse that which they haue said, bicause suchthings conteine no contradiction in themselues, neither are they contrary to the essence of the thing where they happen: for a stone which a man throwes on highe, leanes not for al that to be a stone, like as also by the same mouing it is not depriued of his weightinesse.

Touching the Example of the Fire, they answere, that there is one selfe reason bothe of lighte and heauie

things, and that without any corruption of their Essence, their naturall mouings maie be chaunged by force and violence donne to them. Touching their allegation of the fire, which contrary to his nature (that is to skorche and burne) refreshed the three Iewes in the Furnace of Babylon, they aunswere, that the fire, for all that was in nothing altered, neither touching his Essence, nor in respecte of his qualities: Wherefore the prose fell oute, in that it sparing the sayde three Children, burnte and consumed the Tormentoures, or suche as had office to dresse it.

By whiche maye be well alleaged, that why it did not offende them, proceaded not for that his nature or qualitie were in any thing chaunged, but onely bicause his action was suspended.

And where they alleage that two Bodies may be at once in one place, prouing the same by that whiche is written in S. Iohn, that Christe entred where his Disciples were, the dores being shutte: The Ministers aunswere, that it is not so in the Texte, but that the Disciples being assembled in one place, Iesus Christe stode, and appeared in the middest of them: By which it cannot be inferred that he entred the place where they were without opening the dores, nor that he did pearce or penetrate them to make his entrie.

And it is no lesse likely true, that they were open and shutte againe, than the dores whiche the Aungell opened & shutte againe, when he was sente to deliuer S. Peter out of Prison, and when he was likewise sente for the deliuery of the Apostles. Actor. 12. Actor. 5.

And where they bring in a grosse Body passing throughe a straite place, alleaging the example of a Cable throughe the hole of a Needle, the Ministers finde it alleaged to euill pourpose, as an argumente founded vppon a thing impossible, and saye further, that the Doctours haue euill vnderstande the tearme of Camelos, whiche is vsurped in the Scripture not for a Cable, but for a Camell: As is manifeste inoughe to those that are but slenderly exercised in the antiquities of the Hebrewes, and as appeareth by the opinion

of

of Angelius Caninius, vppon the ende of his *Chaldey* Grammer: Touching the conclusion, whiche the Doctors drawe of the former examples it is to euil pourpose, and grounded vppon the Antecedentes and premisses which they bring in presupposed, and neither as yet confessed by vs, nor wil not be in the sense wherein they alleage them, for the reasons here afore declared.

Touching that which they say against the opinion of the Ministers, that one body at one instante can not be in two places, yea were it the body of Iesus Christ, and that it was neuer written by any the Auncientes, nor proponed afore the comming of Peter Martyr, and Theodore de Beza, the Ministers mainteine it was denouched afore their time, as S. Augustine in his Epistle written to Dardanus, vsing these termes: According to this fourme, saith he, (meaning the corporall fourme of Iesus Christ) we must not thinke that it is euery where, as also we must vse good heede, that in establishing to him his Diuinitie, we take not from him the truthe of his bodie: And in an other place he saith, that by reason of the nature and measure of his body, he is in one place of heauen: Theodoretus vsing the selfe same speeche or Phrase in his seconde Dialogue, as hathe beene alleaged here before: Like as also Vigilius in his fourthe Booke against Eutiches, vseth this Question, if it be but a Nature of the Worde and the Flesh, howe comes it that the Flesh is not in euery place, as the Worde is euery where (of which Worde the Flesh was taken to constitute a person and Hypostase.) For when it was vpon the earth, it was not in heauen, and now that it is in heauen, sure it can not be vpon earth: And much lesse that it is there, seeing we expect that Iesus Christ come according to the Flesh, whom notwithstanding we beleeue is with vs on earth, according as he is the Worde: By these Authorities and such like which are often found in the writings of the Auncients, the worlde may perceiue that Peter Martyr and Theodore de Beza, be not the first Authoures of this Doctrine, but that it is falsly laide vppon them, bicause they haue but drawne, and as it were written it worde for

worde out of the Bookes of the Auncients.

Where the Doctoures pretend, that the fourme of Argument which ỹ Ministers vse, affirming that to say any thing is impossible to God, dothe not derogate his omnipotencie: destroyeth the fourme of argument vsed by the Angell speaking to the virgine, for the confirmation of his message, that nothing was impossible to God: the ministers Answer, that that is nothing to purpose, bicause the question doth neither importe a thing containing in it selfe any contradiction, nor that is contrary to the truthe of God. Touching the opinion of the Doctors, that God can chaunge the nature and qualitie of things, there is none that doubtes thereof: But when that is done, it must also be auowed that things being changed, remaine no more in their first nature: and the Ministers say that it is not all one touching the thing here proponed, bicause the Doctoures would haue a thing dwell in his essence and nature, notwithstanding his essentiall partes be chaunged, yea and wholly extincte and abolished: Touching the limitation of the power of God on the behalfe of his creatures, there is no man so senceleſſe, as to enterprise to limite in all respectes, that which he will, and that confesseth not, that he may ordeine and dispose of all his Creatures in general as it plesoth him, and as a potter doth of his mould, wherein their opinion runnes that the authorite of Ieremie ought to be referred thither, as appeareth clearely by these Hebrue wordes, *lo gippale mimuecha col-dauar*, which is, Lord, nothing shall be harde to thée.

Touching the perill which the Doctoures pretende, may rise of the Ministers saide Aunsweres, they say, that people of good and sounde iudgement, can not frame any euill consequence of it, considering that all this Doctrine is true, and containes no obscuritie: but if perhappes any euill putte an euill profite of it, it is to be imputed to them selues and their euill vnderstanding, by which, not only any Doctrine, but also the worde of God it selfe may sometimes be peruerted and corrupted: To be short, all things (as sayeth the Apostle) are cleane to those that be cleane, and filthie

to

to such as are so, and haue a wicked Conscience. Where the Doctoures alleage, that there may be occasion taken by the Doctrine aforesaide, to interpreate the Scriptures according to a selfe sense and fansie, the Ministers denie it, and say: That if the worlde enterprise it, it is easie inough to reiecte his interpretation as not correspondente to the Rules and Analogie of Faithe, wherewith the sayde Doctrine and interpretation of the Ministers dothe agree and consent.

And where they say that the Ministers chaunge and alter the Scripture, they Aunswere that it is a reproche and slaunder not to be verified againste them, neither touching their writings, their wordes, nor any thing by them deliuered, either by speeche or thought.

Where they say that the Scripture is of opinion that the bodie of Iesus Christe is in two places, the Ministers denie it, and say, that (on the contrary) the Scripture establisheth him in heauen and not elsewhere: And Heauen muste containe hym, vntill the time of restauration of all that hathe beene forespoken by the mouthe of his holy Prophets, from the beginning of the worlde.

And where they alleage that the Scripture ought not to be interpreted according to the sense and fansie of euery one. The Ministers confesse it with this Addition, that all interpretations ought to be examined as S. Paule saithe, and that suche examination be made by the collation and conference of the Scriptures.

And lastly, where the Doctoures accuse the Ministers, to haue alleaged no place of the Scripture, before they produced the Auncientes to confirme their sayde Doctrine, the Ministers say, they are falsely imposed, for that, if they well remember, they alleaged to the same ende in the beginning of their discourse, the opinion of S. Paule, written in the seconde Epistle to Timothe, and the second Chapter, where it is saide that God can not denie himselfe, and also that is written in the sixthe Chapiter to the Hebrues, that it is impossible for God to lie:

Which places together with the opinions of the Auncients, were not alleaged as to diminiche the omnipotencie of God, but rather to establiche it, and cut of the way to many impieties and blasphemies, which they would fallly exhibite, and couer them vnder the couler of Gods almightinesse, without hauing regard to the will declared, to which we must referre the power.

## The sixth day of disputation,

being Tewsday the sixteenth of *Julie.*

THe Doctoures Obiecte, that they haue made this Argumente: God can not bring to passe that one body be in two places: then God is not Almightie: which consequence how necessary it is, is fully manifest without other proofe, by the lawe of contradiction: for according to the rule holden in all Schooles of Philosophers, two contradictions can not be true: To be able to doe all things, and not able to do certaine particulare things, be contradictions, seeing this particulare thing is one part of the whole: So that it must needes be, that if the antecedent be true, the consequent must befalle, according to the lawe of contradiction, for both can not be true together, as things of contradiction: And albeit by the knowledge of the very termes, the consequēce may be iudged to be good, yet it may easily be knowne by the handling of the Obiection against the Answere of the Ministers, that the Doctours haue proued the consequence: This was the reason of the Ministers, God can not lie nor sinne, and can not bring to passe that things done, should not be done, because that either it impugnes his nature, or there is repugnancie of the parte of the creatures, because there is contradiction entangled. But the Doctors affirmed in their Obiection, that there is no such thing in the Question poponed,

poned, which is, if one body may be in two places: whereof they make this kinde of Arguing taken of their Obiection: God can doe all things that impugne not his nature, either when there is no resistance of the parte of the creatures, and that there is implied no contradiction: to affirme that a body may be in two places at one instant, is a thing not repugnāt to the nature of God, and of the parte of the body doth implie no contradiction. Then God can do it, or else so, God cannot do it: then it foloweth that God is not almightie: in this sorte is proponed the reason and deduction of the antecedent and consequent, and also the prœfe of the assumption or seconde propolition: for it is proued that there is no contradiction in saying that one body may be in two places, & that it doth not impugne the nature of God, whereof the prœfe hathe bene made by the Example of like things, as God may bring to passe that two bodies may be in one place, with other like reasons, which are deduced in the Obiection.

And where they say the Doctoures doe argue euil from a particulare to an vniuersal, it seemes (vnder correction) they haue forgotten the rules of Dialectice, as being most certaine that this rule hathe place in the affirmatiue, and not in the negatiue: But (of the contrary) when there is any thing affirmed generally, and the default is proued in particular (as say the Dialecticians.) *Ad negationem particularis sequitur negatio eius quod vniuersaliter affirmatum est.* In like sorte when any thing is affirmed of the whole which hath many partes, and the default be proued in one parte, the destruction of the whole foloweth: As if one would say, all the body is whole, who would proue one part of that body diseased, shuld proue this propolition false, all the body is whole: such is the manner of arguing which the Doctors haue made, that is, that if God can not do a particulare thing (as to bring to passe that one body be in two places) then he can not doe all things, or if he can doe all things, he can also doe that.

They are sory to be referred to their Dialecticke, as consi-dering none other end, than to make the antecedent graunted, which is, that God can not bring to passe that one body

be in two places: wherein for their partes they are glad to vnderstand the Resolution of the Ministers vpon this Article, which is, that God can not bring to passe, nor cã not will, that one body be in two places, bicause it implies cõtradiction. And where the Ministers say, that the Doctors by their reasons, can not inferre the truthe of the antecedent, the Doctors confesse it, by which the ministers also perceiue that the reasõs which they haue brought forth, are nothing worth to ẏ confirmation of the Antecedent, which is their resolution. But the Doctoures say, that those reasons, albeit they were not vailable, yet were they brought forthe by the ministers, to this end, to proue ẏ impossibilitie of God to bring to passe that one body should be in two places.

For the Article beginning touching the authorities, &c, the Doctoures Obiecte, that the Auncientes neuer thoughte to make any exception of any thing which is not subiecte to the power of God: for (as it is manifest) he that saith all, excepteth nothing, so, when the scripture saithe that God is almightie, hir meaning is clear, that there is no exception: and to giue exception in this, should be no lesse to gainesay many places of Gods worde, than to blaspheme his power. But the Doctoures say, that the Auncientes haue interpreted the omnipotencie of God not to comprehend that which toucheth the perfection of his nature, but onely that which concerneth creatures: So that there be not to manifest contradiction & repugnancie of their parte. The present Question importes not that there is not contradiction, that one body be a body, and that at one instant it be in diuers places: For of the essence of bodies, speaking of one body hauing his dimensions, according to the phrase of the Philosophers *de predicamento quantitatis*, it is certaine, that the Dimensions be of the essence of a body: but to be circumscript and enclosed in a place, is accidentall: The same being declared by Philosophie: for the moste high heauen according to his whole, is a body, and yet it is not in place according to his whole. And therefore it is not a thing essentiall to a body, to be enclosed in one place.

Wherein

Wherein to speake of the present matter, the Ministers should be muche encombred to proue that the body of Iesus Christe is in one place in Heauen, seeing it is written in the fourthe of the Ephesians, he is mounted aboue all the Heauens, oute of the which there is no place, as they speake of places in regarde of bodies according to nature: And if it were so, that it were essentiall to one body, to be in one place (according to the rule which the Ministers giue) there wold followe an other blasphemie againste the omnipotencie of God, that God could not make one body, and bestow it, aboue all the Heauens, and (to speake more vniuersally) that God could not make a body without place equal to his greatnesse.

Touching the Allegations proponed by the Ministers of certaine Auncient authoures, the Doctoures Obiecte that those Allegations make againste themselues, because, to be enclosed in one place, depends not of the essence of the body, nor his dimensions, as appeareth by the Authorities produced, making mention of the Aungels who haue no bodies: it it is not then an essentiall reason, that the dimension of one body be contained in one place: Neither dothe all this blonderment of Authorities make any thing to purpose, seeing they tend not but to shew that the natural propertie of creatures, is different from the nature Diuine, as saithe S. Basile expresselyin the place alleaged by the Ministers, as S. Ambrose in the first Booke of the holy Ghost. Chap. 7. where the saide Authoures declare that God of his nature may be euerywhere, as his creatures by their natures, not: neither do the said Authors pretend that God by his omnipotencie can not make one body to be in diuers places, seeing euen they (or their like) when they come to speake of the power of God in the holy sacrament, affirme that Christes body is in heauen, and in the holy Sacramente, inueighing also by the same power, that the Aungels and soules of the blessed, may be in many places, and the Doctours wil recite in their Resolution.

Where the Ministers saye that a Body muste be circumscripte of the place according to his essentiall propertie: that

hath bene declared falle hære befoze: And the Ministers confounde the name of a body, which signifieth sometimes substance, sometimes quantitie, hauing his dimensions, largenesse, length, and profoundnesse: which dimensions are essentiall in a body, taking body for fourme of quantitie, and not in a substantial body, for then it is accidentall: It is most certaine that God may seperate the accidents of a body, & make a substance without accidents, otherwayes would folow an other blasphemie, that God coulde not seperate the accident from a subiect and substance: And where the Ministers say, that by a violent mouing, a stone may be throwne on highe, it is not Aunswered to the Question: For the Doctours demaunde, saing it is essentiall and naturall to a body earthly and heauie in respecte of his waight and heauinesse to tende downeward, to know, if God by his only vertue against the natural propertie of a body heauie and waighty, can not hold and suspend it on highe.

And touching the exation which the Ministers make of a most strong and mightie argument againste their Doctrine, that two bodies may be in one place according to the prowfe taken of the scripture (not only to iustifie that God can bring to passe that two bodies may be in one place, but also that he hath done it) serues for nothing to couer their erroure, as to say, that in S. Iohn it is not written that our Lord did not enter by the gates shutte, but that he was in the midst of them and stode: where the saide Ministers helde their peace, and omitted this Uerbe *venit*, reasting onely vppon this Uerbe *stetit*: For the expresse Texte of S. Iohn, Chapter. 21. verse. 19. saythe, that the dores being shut, Jesus came into the place where the Disciples were assembled, and was there in the middest of them: And therefore we nowe aske them, seeing the Scripture sayeth he came thither the Dores being shutte, and was in the middest of them: Whether he was in the middest of them, and in the saide place, wythoute entring: Or if he dyd enter, seeing the Texte beares that the Dores were shutte when hee came, how will they proue by the Scripture that he entred there,

but

but by the shutte dores: the same seeming a greater miracle to be in the middest of his Disciples, without entring into the place where they were. This refuge is to light to saie, it is not written, that he entred: For S. Augustine in his Booke de Agone Christiano Chap. 24. vseth these words: *Nec nos moueat quòd clausis ostijs subito eum apparuisse Discipulis scriptum est: vt propterea negemus illud fuisse humanũ, quia contra naturam huius Corporis videmus illud per clausa ostia intrare: omnia enim possibilia sunt Deo. Nam & ambulare super aquas contra naturam huius Corporis esse manifestum est: & tamen non solum ipse Dominus ante Passionem ambulauit, sed etiam Petrum ambulare fecit:* Wherein appeares that S. Augustine holdes openly that our Lord entred by the shutte dores: referring the whole to the almightinesse of God.

Besides, the Texte of S. Luke, ioined with the authoritie of S. Iohn, declares that he entred throughe the dores: for the Apostles had not had reasonable occasion to thinke it was a Spirite, and not a Body, seing him in the semblance of a man before them, but that he entred otherwayes, then a true Body and a true man can do, meaning that he entred by the shutte dores, whiche a true man and true body coulde no waye do. Neither coulde it serue to any pourpose to saie, that the dores were open, and then shutte by myracle or otherwayes: For so mighte a true body & a true man enter, the same taking away al occasion to thinke that it was a Spirite or Vision. Luke, 24.

Moreouer the Doctours saie, that all the Auncient Heretikes and Christians were of this common accorde, that Iesus Christe passed throughe: but their difference was suche, as at this daye is betwene the Doctours and the Ministers: The Auncient Heretikes helde, that Christe, after his Resurrection had not a true bodye, bicause he did workes contrary to the nature of a body, the same implying contradictiõ in the naturall body, that in one instante he was in one selfe place with an other bodye, as when he had passed throughe the dores: The Ancient Christian Catholikes answered, that truely the nature of the Body bare, that he coulde not

passe throughe the dores, issue out of the bodye of the Virgyn in his byrthe without breaking it, nor come throughe the stone of the Sepulcher in his Resurrection, but yet that it did not imply contradiction that two bodies shoulde be together by the Omnipotencie of God, bicause it was sohappened in the three cases done and recited.

The firste that speakes of it, is Iustinus Martyr, in the 117. Question againste the Gentiles, wherein he makes this Demaunde, If a bodye grosse or thicke (saithe he) be lette to be able to passe throughe the dores, howe did our Lorde enter the dores being shutte, after his Resurrectiō? And if it be so, why was the stone rolled by the Angel from ỹ mouthe of the graue, to the ende his body might rise againe? he aunsweres, euen as our Lorde withoute chaunging his Bodye into a Spryte, walked vppon the sea, making in deede by his Diuine power the sea harde to walke vpon it, and not onely to beare his body, but S. Peters also: euen so by his diuine power came he out of his graue, the stone lying vppon it, and entred to his Disciples the dores being shutte, by whiche as we haue to vnderstande, that things proceeding of diuerse vertues, oughte to haue a like Faithe, euen so wee oughte to know that suche things as passe nature, when they are done in ỹ same by power diuine, ought not be measured according to the reason and propertie of nature: in whiche respecte our Lorde seeing his Disciples troubled with his entrie, offered them to touch the partes of his body, & the markes & skarres of his woundes, to the end they might see he did not enter by changing his bodye into a spryte, but in his proper body composed of his conuenient dimensions & thicknesse, and that by his Diuine almightinesse, which did al things exceeding the force of nature. S. Hilarie in his third Booke of the Trinitie, euen of thee (saith he) which wilt search things inscrutable, & be iudge of Gods secrets & his power, I aske coūsel, that thou giue me reason andsolution only of this deede, yea to me that am ignorant & beleue simply in God touching al things as he hath saide and pronounced them: I meane, that as the Lord hath oftentimes presented himselfe after his Resurrection to

be

be seene and knowne of those who beleued it not: So the same Lorde applying him selfe to the imbecilitie of our vnderstanding, and to satisfie the doubtes of the vnfaithefull, shewes a secrete, & an acte of his Omnipotencie. Therefore expounde to me, who euer thou arte, that wilte be a searcher of the Omnipotencie of God, the reason of this facte: The Disciples were enclosed together, and drawne into a secrete place: the Lorde reuealed him selfe to Thomas, to confirme his Faithe according to the condition he desired, that is, to touche his body, and proue his woundes: For whiche reason and cause, it muste nædes be, that he bare euen that true body wherein he had receiued those woundes. I aske then, seeing he was Corporall, by what parte of the house did he thruste or intrude him selfe within? For I see the Euangelistes opnion is plaine, that Jesus came the dores being shutte, and was amidde his Disciples: Did he penetrate the grosse walles, or great barre of wode that was betwene bothe? It is moste true, he entred without fiction or deceite. Lette thy reason folowe and consider his Entrie, and thy vnderstanding enter into the shutte house with him: Thou seest that all is sounde and faste at the Locke, and yet he was in the middest of his Disciples, but that is, bicause all things are open to him by his Omnipotencie. Thou blamest things inuisible, I aske thee againe the reason of that thing visible. From the Walles or Gates firme nothing recules or gines place: And yet I see of the contrarie the wode and stones by their nature cannot receiue suche entrie. The Lordes Body was not vnmade, to be made againe of nothing: then from whence comes it, that he was in the middest without opening the dore? The sense and the worde faile in this, and the truthe of the acte is aboue mannes reason, so that as wee are abused of the byrthe of the Sonne of God, so do wee also lye of that Entrie: wee saie, the facte is false, and that it did not so happen, bicause we are not able to vnderstande the reason, and bicause our sense and iudgemente faile, wee saie, there was no suche facte:

but

but the Faithe & beliefe of the facte conuinceth our dreame: the Lorde was amidde his Apostles the house being shutte, and the Sonne of God was borne of his Father: do not denie that he entred thus, bicause by the infirmitie of the spirite thou arte not able to comprehende this manner of entrie. I coulde amplifie like factes in all his creatures, but the Lord hath wel forseene in him selfe, to haue vs conteined in necessitie and modestie by the nature of our bodyes: wee declare sufficiently that we woulde be an other God, if wee had the power, and bicause we cannot by the audacitie of our wicked will, reuerse the nature of truthe, at the leaste wee gainesaie it, and raise warre with the wordes of God.

S. Ambrose in his seconde Booke vppon S Luke the 24. Chapter, saithe, Throughe the dores. S Chrysostome vppon S. Iohn proues by suche entrie, that Jesus Christe was so borne of the Virgyn, that shee remained a Virgyn in her delivery and after, without any breaking: concluding that bothe the one and the other facte procéede of the omnipotencie of God. The same Chrysostome in his seconde Homilie vpon the Symbol of the Apostles, vseth these wordes, how is it that Christe entred, the gates being shutte &c. bicause suche things are aboue vs, and we cannot yelde a reason of this miracle, we holde it by Faithe.

S Ierome in his firste Booke against Iouinian, and in his Epistle to Pammachius, against the errours of Iohn Ierosolymitan, who saide that Jesus had not a true Bodye after his resurrectiō, bicause it was impossible a true body shoulde passe throughe the dores, and that he was in the same place with an other body, answeres, that the same letted not that the nature of the body did not remaine, bicause the acte procéeded of the almightinesse of God: He vseth also these speaches, tell me thou subtil disputer, whiche is the greatest, either to hang all the weighte and greatnesse of the earthe vpon nothing, ballaunce it aboue the freighte of the waters, or that God passe by a dore shutte, and the Creature obeye his Creatour: That whiche is the greatest, thou wilt agree vnto easily, and whiche is the leaste, thou reprocheste: S. Augustine

gustie in his thirtenth Epistle for an example of Goddes Omnipotencie, recites also this facte, as in declaration aswell that our Lorde was borne by the Virgyn without any breaking of her Bodye, as also that Goddes Almightinesse is greater than wee can comprehende.

S. Augustine also recites the same Facte in his Booke de Agone Christiano againste the Valentinians, and others that denyed the true Substaunce of the Bodye of Jesus Christe, bicause, contrarie to the nature of Bodyes, he did so passe and enter.

Amphilochius and Theodoret in the seconde Dialogue disputing of this deede againste Eutyches, who helde also that after the Resurrection Christes Humanitie was transnatured into his Diuinitie, bicause that against the nature of bodyes he passed in that order through the doores being shutte, answere with the others, that suche an effecte importes not contradiction to the nature of the bodye, as proceeding of the Omnipotencie of God, and not of the nature of the bodye. Cyril in the 12. Booke vppon S. Iohn rebukes also suche as seeke to compasse the myracles and doings of God according to their iudgements and propertie of creatures, against whom he vseth sharpe speache.

S. Augustine recites in his firste Booke againste Iulian Chap. 2. that Iouinian was an Heretike, in that he saide, the Virgyns wombe was disclosed in her deliuery, whiche he saide so, for feare to fall into the Heresie of the Manicheans, whose opinion was that Jesus had not a true body, bicause he was borne without breaking of his mother, so that to eschue this Heresie, he did rather denie that the Virgyn remained a Virgyn: This kinde of Heresie was also laide vppon Origen, like as also some alleage that the Ancientes (as Tertullian) was of this opinion.

By these testimonies the Doctoures conclude, that two bodyes to be penetrated and be in one selfe place by the Diuine vertue, implies no contradiction, whiche places if they were wel considered, men would receiue no newe interpretation againste the expresse worde of God, seeing the texte

beares simply, that Christe came to his Disciples the dores being shutte.

It maye be sene easily, howe Caluin in his Institution hathe depraued the sense of this place of S. Iohn, with other like, saying, what so euer the worlde alleageth againe, that Christe issued out of the Graue, & not opened it, & entred to his disciples, ỹ Chamber dore being shut, is nothing worth any more to mainteine theire errour: For as the water serued to Iesus Christe as a firme pauemente to walke vpon the Lake, so we ought not thinke it strange, if the hardenesse of the stone became softe, to giue him place.

Lib. 4. Cap. 17. Sect. 29.

Beza also in his seconde Dialogue againste Heshusius, saithe: The Stone became nothing, to the ende the Lorde mighte passe to his Resurrection, and then after God refashioned it.

It foloweth also in the terte of Caluin, that to enter into a Chamber the dores being shutte, is not to saie he pierced the woode, but onely he made opening by his Diuine vertue, in sorte that in a wonderfull manner, he was in the middest of his Disciples, notwithstanding the dores were shutte.

He saithe further, whiche they bring in of S. Luke, that he banished suddainely from his Disciples whiche wente to Emaus: it serues them for nothing, and applies to our auauntage. For to take awaye the sighte of his Body, he is not made inuisible, but onely is banished, as also the saide Euangeliste dothe witnesse: when he walked he was not transfigured nor disguised, as to be inuisible, but he gouerned and helde their eies. These friuolous and vaine exposi-tions be broughte in by Caluin and his like, to eschue confession that God is able to bring to passe that one body be in diuerse places, and yet the proper text of the Scripture witnesseth that two bodyes may be by the power of God in one selfe place, as also that one bodye hauing colour, and afore visible, by Goddes power is made inuisible, without any let to the eies of suche as may see: the same being confirmed by S. Luke, saying, Aphantos egeneto apanton, *Inuisibilis factus*

est

*esti ab ipsis*, notwithstanding there were no more lette of the parte of the Disciples: For it is saide afore, that theire eies were opened to know him: Whereunto all antiquitie consentes. The Doctours adde to confirme the penetration of the dimensions, an other acte: that our Lord mounted to the Heauens, which he did neither diuide nor rent, and therfore it must nedes be, that he penetrated them, as the Scripture beares in proper termes.

The Doctoures signifie to the saide Ministers, that they cannot produce one onely Anciente of sounde renowme, hauing expounded these places, of whom thei may learne their so many diuerse interpretations, neither dothe it serue to colour their exposition, the texte alleaged of the Actes of the Apostles where S. Peter went out of prison, in which place is no speach at al of opening the dores of ẏ saide prison: neither is it saide (as in S. Iohn) that the dores of the prison being shut, S Peter came forth: but that the Aungell arriued there, when the Garde before the dore watched the prison: where they saye, the dores were open to S. Peter, it agreeth not with the opinion of S. Iohn, that the dores were shutte when our Lorde entred. Hebr. 4. 14. Iohan. 12.

The like reason alleaged by the saide Ministers of the fifth of the Actes is vnprofitable to this purpose, aswell as the firste, and for the same cause.

And to shewe clearely and euidentely, that againste the naturall propertie of Bodyes God can make, that a greate and grosse Bodye maye passe into a space and place inequall to his greatenesse, largenesse, and thickenesse: The Doctoures haue recited that whiche our Lorde saithe in S. Mathewe 19. It is more easie that a Cable enter the eie of a Nedle, than a Riche man into the Kingdome of Heauen, whereunto the Ministers haue answered two things: The one, that in the inuolution we must not turne Cable, but rather Camel: notwithstanding their owne frenche Bible of the impression of Antony Kebul, which they haue brought, conteineth the versiõ of this word Cable: like as also Caluin in his Harmony of the fours Euangelists saith, it is the better.

Wherein may be sæne and founde true that which Tertullian inueigheth againste the Valentinians, and Irenæus againste him in the firste Booke Chap. 14. that suche as are separated from vs, to putte themselues in an other schole, deuise alwayes some new thing, to the end the Disciples may be founde more able than the Maisters: But be it that the worde of Camel is graunted to them (which the Doctoures doubte not hathe bene expounded by S. Hilarie, S. Ierome, & others) the reason is yet stronger: For it is more vnlikely and repugnante, that a crooked Camel grosse and greate, enter the hole of a Nædle, than a Cable. The other reason giuen by the Ministers is, that God maye bring to passe that a Camell or Cable enter the eie of a Nædle, whiche is notwithstanding againste the pure worde of Iesus Christe, whiche saith, It is not impossible to God to dow it, but rather easie, and by comparison, more easie to God than to make a Riche man enter into the Kingdome of Heauen, whiche our Lorde saithe notwithstanding to be possible, not to men, but to God, to whom nothing is impossible: whereupon the doctours saie, that if God can dow that whiche is moste harde, he maye dow that whiche is moste easie: The texte of the Scripture importes that God may bring to passe that a rich man enter into the Kingdome of Heauen, whiche is moste harde, then he maye bring to passe, that a Camell (or Cable) enter the eie of a Nædle, whiche is more easie.

The aunsweres of the Ministers here before confuted, tend to these absurdities and blasphemies, that Iesus Christ by his Omnipotencie could not enter throughe the dores being shutte: that he coulde not issue out of the woombe of his Mother, through her body, without breaking: that he could not bring to passe that a body visible should be inuisible: that a body greate and grosse coulde be in a place inequal to himselfe: that he could by his Diuine power make penetration of the Dimensions, and that he maye bring to passe by the same power Diuine, that one body be in two places (for it is al one reason of this laste Article and the others) albeit such things are declared in the Scripture not onely possible, but

that

that the moste parte haue bene done.

And the Doctoures doe much maruell how the Ministers dare denie this, seing themselues must necessarily confesse, (if the Doctrine of the Supper which they giue be true) that the bodye of Jesus Christe is in diuers places, which they proue thus: The faithfull receiue in their soules Really, the substance of the body and blond of Jesus Christe, by the operation of the holy Ghost, and not onely the bread and wine, or the effecte and vertue of the same Sacrament, as Caluine saithe in his institutions, lib.4.cap.17.sect.11. The Doctoures conclude thus: it is impossible that a person receiue the substance of the body of Jesus Christ in himself, but that the body of Jesus Christe must be in him: All the Faithfull which be at the Supper, receiue him in their soules, so that it muste nedes be that the body of Jesus Christe be in them, and by consequence in diuers places, as euery where, where their Supper is made, and likewise in Heauen. They say further, that Caluine in his Institutions, lib.4.cap.17.sect.24. mainteines that in the Supper, the power of God is requisite, to the ende the Flesthe of Jesus Christe penetrate into vs, and that humaine nature can not comprehende that, but nedes must Gods power worke in it: By which meane Caluine puttes, by the power of God, the Flesthe of Jesus Christe in many places, as bothe in heauen, and vs, into whom he must penetrate by the power of God: And in the.10.number, he saithe, that the truthe signified and represented by signes, muste be represented and exhibited in the very place where the signes be, which he proues by reason in many places, that is, that the signes must not be voide, no more than the pilloure was voide of the holy spirite: But euen as the essence and substance of the holy Ghoste was conioyned and present with the pilloure, euen so that the Flesthe and Blond of our Lord, afore there was true Sacrament, must nedes be knitte and united with the signes: The places be against Heshusius, and in his Boke of the Supper, 1. Cor. Cap. 11. Whereunto howe so euer the Ministers Aunswere, the Doctoures desire that the text of Caluine together with the rea-

sons which he brings of the holy spirite, may be well weighed and considered.

They Obiect further, that the Ministers in their Supper, attribute more to the humaine vertue, than to the omnipotencie of God, yea they doe more than God coulde doe, as in that they vaunt to doe a thing by their Faith, which implies contradiction, saying in their Confession of Faithe exhibited at Poissi, to the Bishoppes which were in the congregation, that Faith makes things absent, present at one instant, & in one place, ý is in the soules of the Faithfull when they make the supper: the same being as much as if they had saide, that faith makes things not present, present in one time & place: so as, to euery Faithfull man in the Supper comming worthily, the Body of Iesus Christe is there present in vertue of Faith: And yet is he not there present, as themselues holde, saying, He is but in Heauen: wherein maye be seene implication of contradiction that is presente, and not presente Really: neither can it serue to any purpose a little slippe or scape, whiche they saide to vs, that the body of Christe is on high corporally, but in the hearts of the Faithfull in the supper spiritually: For the spiritualitie can not take away the substance of the thing, and their Faith can not bring to passe that a body is not a body, and that a body hathe not his dimensions, as they haue saide here before.

Therefore in what sorte so euer, they confesse that the Faithfull in the Supper receiue the substance of the body of Iesus Christe into their soules, they muste necessarily and willingly confesse, that either their Faithe is more mightie than the vertue and infinite power of God, or else that God can bring to passe, that his body shall be locally in Heauen, and Sacramentally (Really notwithstanding and substancially) in the Sacrament of the Aultare, in which pointe the Doctoures desire to heare the Ministers, and after to sette downe their Aunswere by writing: The Ministers can neuer shewe by the worde of God, that their Faithe can bring to passe, that in one instant and in one place, a thing shall be present and not present: And it is as muche to say, a thing

present

presente and not presente by Faithe, as to say the body of Jesus Christe is in a Faithfull man, and is not: Neither neede there to be put any chanell of the power of the holy Spirite, to make the Flesshe of Jesus Christe slide from Heauen hither, if the saide Flesshe were not but in Heauen, and yet come to vs.

And touching the poyntes which the Doctoures haue obiected that Peter Martyr, and Theodore de Beza, were the first that saide that God could not bring to passe that one body might be in two places, which newe Doctrine the Ministers would confirme by antiquitie, & we not name it otherwayes than blasphemie. The Doctors say, that many times, they haue prayed the ministers not to lose time, & to the end things might be better cleared, to say nothing that were not to purpose: which notwithstanding, they alleage forthwith ẏ testimonies of the fathers, to shew ẏ a body by nature is circumscript, & naturally can not be in many places: but ẏ same authors speake nothing, that God is able to do it: And yet S. Augustine and others in their places recited by the Doctors, touching the Article of the doores being shutte, witnesse, that by ẏ power of God two bodies may occupie one place, which containes the like difficultie: and when it comes to the prose of the reall presence of the body and bloud of Christ, they are to shew euidently, that all the auncients wholly which haue spoken of the Sacrament, haue not onely confessed hys abilitie to bring to passe that his body was on highe in heauen, and here below in the Sacrament, but also they with one accorde haue auouched to beleeue according to the worde of Jesus Christe, that he is in Heauen, and here in the Sacrament. The Doctoures demaunde of the Ministers, if any afore Peter Martyr, and Theodore de Beza, haue denyed this power of God, whome they maruell not if they so muche magnifie, seeing of them they haue taken all the places alleaged.

For the Article that begins, where the Doctours pretende that the forme, &c, the Doctoures say this forme is common as often as the power of God is debated vppon, neither can

can the prose be better guided, than to folowe the worde of the Aungell, that there is nothing impossible to God: From which, when any thing is exempted, there is alleaged the selfe same that the Ministers inferre, that there is a repugnancie of things, wherof folowes an implication of contradiction: as did the auncient Heretikes against the Flesshe of Jesus Christe, alleaging alwayes some impossibilitie according to nature: doing the like againste the Article of Resurrection and Incarnation, as if there had bene contradiction that God was man, & man was God: As shall be easie to a wicked mind, to forge alwayes some contradiction in his spirite, according to ỹ properties of nature: for the Article beginning, wher the Doctors alleage that God can change, &c, The Doctoures say they haue not well conceiued their meaning: For they take for a thing absurde, that a substance resting affected of his qualities, may by Gods power, haue effectes contrary to his qualities: As if God coulde not bring to passe by his omnipotencie, that the fire possessing his natural heat, in place to burne, do refreshe and qualifie, which no man of soumde iudgement, and a Christian would not denie: For the Article, touching the limitation of the powver, &c, the Doctoures say, it semes by the Aunswere of the Ministers, that Gods power is limitted according to his will: which is as muche to say, as God can not but that which he willes, which is manifestly false.

Touching the Hebrue alleaged, it semes the Ministers haue desire to shewe their skill therein: For suche recitall is nothing to purpose, resting principally vpon the worde *danar*, which is as muche to say as a thing, but it meanes not that we oughte to vnderstand it as a thing done: the sense of the place is suche by the worde, shall any thing be hid from me? And bicause harde things be hid, and things impossible also more hid, they haue therefore turned, is there any thing hard (or impossible) to me: which Pagninus and other interpreters of the Hebrue tonge, shew well that the verbe *Pala*, signifieth to hide. The Doctoures had not made Aunswere to this, but to make it knowne that they are not allouted at

one

one worde of Hebrue.

For the Article beginning, touching the daunger, &c, the Doctours say they are but wordes superfluous, and what so euer the Ministers were able to produce, others might vse againste them. And where they say it is a reproche in that they are obiected to corrupte the scripture, the Doctors say, ỳ the Ministers can not deny, that they chaunge not the sense, and glose the matter of the Supper, this is my body, this is my bloude: By which and suche like Authorities vnder pretext of obscure reasons, euery one may pretend to corrupte the other Scriptures, and alleage certaine impossibilities of nature, and contradictions.

For the Article beginning, touching the opinion of the scripture, that the body, &c, the Doctors say, that in time and place they will declare their Obiections, and make a more large discourse of the Sacrament of the Altare.

Touching the Obiection of the Doctoures, that the contrary parte doe not grounde their affirmation (which is that God can not bring to passe that one body be in two places) vppon the expresse testimonie of the Scripture, or that they can deduce it thereof: the Ministers haue alleaged for all their places, but that God can not lie, God can not deny him selfe. But the Doctoures say this consequence is nothing worthe: God can not lie: God then can not bring to passe that one body be in two places, which notwithstanding it had behoued the Ministers to haue made so, if the places brought in, had serued to the purpose, like as also when it is saide that God can not lie, as the Ministers haue recited: to be able to lie, is not power but infirmitie. So that it behoued to say thus, according to the true sense: God is not infirme or weake, as to be able to lie, than God cannot bring to passe that one body be in two places: which consequence would be ridiculare.

And where the Ministers haue brought in certaine authorities of the Auncientes, to proue that there is diuersitie betweene the Creatures and the Creator, and that the Creator by Nature is euery where, and the Creatures are not in

diuers places naturally: The Doctoures receiue with reuerence the Authorities of the holy Fathers, but there was no neede of their trauaile to produce the saide places for the confirmation of a thing so manifest, and which was not in difficultie: But the Doctors are yet to vnderstand one only place of the Scripture, or one onely Testimonie of the Auncientes, which sayeth, that God coulde not bring to passe that one body were in diuers places: The Doctoures desire the Ministers to receiue with like reuerence the Auncients specially touching the interpretation of the holy Scripture, whose Exposition shall be the iudge betweene them and the Ministers.

Vppon a request made to the Lorde of Neuers by the Ministers to assigne a day for Aunswere particularely to euery Article and reproche heaped before by the Doctoures in their Obiections: The saide Lorde prouided that the Ministers shoulde take away with them at nighte, one of the Copies of the Obiections, to the ende to come readely prepared the next day by none to Aunswere them: whereunto the doctoures agreed, who for their partes made like request, for sufferaunce, to Replie to the Ministers Aunsweres, if they sawe it were so good, with the which they will giue Resolution touching this Article of Gods omnipotencie, to the ende to passe further, and examine the Reall veritie of the bodie of Christe in the Sacramente of the Altare, like as also the Ministers for their partes doe agree to yelde a full Resolution to what so euer shall be deduced by them.

The morowe following, being Wednesday the seuentene of Julie, the companie being assembled, the Lorde of Neuers considering that the day afore, the Doctoures had furnished all the time, so that the Ministers had no opportunitie to aunswere presently, thoughte there was no lesse leisure due to them to Aunswere, and therefore with other necessary respectes, which woulde haue bene a long and weary season, he ordained from thence forthe the conference to passe by writing, and that the Ministers shoulde bring againe the Copie that was giuen them to Aunswere, and sende it vnto him,

signed by them and two Notaries, whereof he woulde cause his secretorie to drawe oute an other copie, to sende to the Doctoures, reseruing with him selfe the Originall, and in like case woulde sende the Ministers, the copie of such as the Doctoures should send to him. Whereunto the one and other parte submitted them selues, and disputed afterwarde by wryting as followeth.

# The Aunswere of the Ministers

to the Doctoures Obiections, giuen vppon *Tuesday the sixtenth of Julie.*

THey denie that the Doctoures consequence is necessary, (which is, God can not bring to passe that one body be in two places at one instant, and that therfore God is not almightie) bicause Gods omnipotencie ought not be measured, but by the things only conformable to his will, and do not derogate either his nature, his wisedom, his truth, or the order he hath established in the world: Whereunto that which the Doctoures preferre, dothe directly resiste, that one selfe body at one selfe instante may be in diuers places, by which it should followe that a body may be a body, and not be limitted, and so by consequence, that he may be and may not be, all together: For the measures (as to be long, large, and thicke, and to be bounded and limitted within certaine endes) are so essentiall to the bodie, that without them he is no more a bodie: in whiche speeche, the Ministers doe in nothing diminishe Goddes omnipotencie, but of the contrarie, establishe it, not attributing to him any mutabilitie or chaunge in his Councell, nor contradiction in his will, for feare to make him lie, a thing impossible to him by the Scripture.

And touching that which the Doctoures alleage of the auncientes, that they haue not denied the almightinesse of God, the Ministers haue declared here before that they haue, and in what cases it may happen: yea Tertullian in his Bookes which he wrote against Praxeas speaking of this matter, vseth this speeche: Certainely nothing is hard to God. But if without iudgement, we vse this sentence, and interprete it according to our fond fansie, we may faine al things of God, and say he hathe made them, bicause he coulde make them: wherin we must not beleeue, that bicause he might, and may do all things, that therefore he hath made that, which he hath not made: but rather to enquire if he haue made it: and so the conclusion folowes, that the power of God is his wil, and his not power likewise his not wil. It rested then to the doctors to shewe that God would make a body, which in one instant should be in diuers places, as to shew that he could do it: And it is a maruellous matter, that they impute againste the ministers, to derogate the almightinesse of God, as to except frō the same, that which is contrary to his wil: seeing they themselues confesse it and except the same things as standing betweene them and the Doctors no other difference, than that they say, that God brings to passe that one body be in diuers places in one instante, bicause he can doe it, and the Ministers affirme, that he doth it not, and can not doe it, bicause he vvill not, for that (according to Tertullian) the power of God is his will.

Touching the Doctoures reason of Philosophie to proue that a body, in respecte it is a body, forbeares not to be in diuers places, the Ministers say, that they suppose a false: which is, that the quantitie is accidentall, and not essentiall to the body. For (that a body is measured, limitted, and circumscript) is so of his essence, that without it, it is no more a bodie, according to S. Augustines opinyon, speaking euen of the bodie of Iesus Christe glorified, that if they take from a bodie his space, he hathe no more place where he can be, and by Consequence, being no where, he is no more.

The

The reason of their Philosophie touching the firste Heauen, not to be in any place, the Ministers denie it, seing to vse the speache of the Scripture, we must confesse that euen aboue the Heauens there is place: As Christe saide to his Disciples, I go to prepare you a place, and in the very place in the house of my Father be many dwellings. And in an other place, There where I am (taking the Present for the Future) there shalbe my seruaunte: in whiche sentence we muste obserue that there be Aduerbes of Place. S. Augustine writing to Dardanus, holdes erpresse opinion that the Body of Iesus Christe must necessarily be in some place in Heauen bicause it is a true Body. Besides in the number of the errours heretofore condemned by the facultie of Paris, it is said erpressely, that the Heauen called by them, Empyreum, is the place of Angelles, of happy Soules, and Humaine bodyes glorified.

Touching that whiche the Doctours pretende that by the Ministers Doctrine (mainteining that a Bodye cannot be without place, nor in many places at one instante) maye be inferred that they blaspheme the power of God. The Ministers of the contrary saie, that the Doctoures blaspheme his Maiestie, whiche they diminishe, as giuing to the Creature, ỳ which belongs to him alone, that is, to be incircumscript: as appeareth by Dydimus in his Booke of the Holy Ghoste, where he prones that the Holy Spirite is God, and not a Creature, bicause it is circumscripte, and all creatures necessarily are circumscripte and lymited: The same resembling also the opinions of S. Basile, Vigilius, and the Maister of Sentences in the firste Booke.

Where they confesse that the Ancientes e happy Spirites are circumscript, albeit they are not corporal Bodyes, they reason directely againste themselues, and properly to prone our opinion heretofore of Bodyes, whiche is, that it cannot be but in what place so euer they are, they are circumscripte. For by an argumente of the Lesse to the More, if the Aungelles whiche haue no Dimension nor measure, be (by their confession) necessarily circumscripte, as being creatures, by

greater reason, the bodyes of men which be Creatures and measured, muste be so.

And where they alleage, that the Auncientes haue not saide, that a Body, by the power of God cannot be in diuers places: that impugnes S. Augustine in his 30. Treatise vpon S. Iohn, which is recited de Consec. Distinct. 2. C. Prima quidem: where speaking of the body of Christe, he saith precisely, that the Bodye of our Lorde, wherewith he rose againe, muste be in one place: teaching thereby that at one time it cannot be in diuerse places. And touching their reason taken of the Sacramente, to enforce and proue their saying, the Ministers answere, that the Angelles neuer vnderstood nor saide, that the body of Jesus Christe was in Heauen and in the Sacrament, in one selfsort & maner, nor that he was in the Sacrament, otherwayes than sacramentally.

And where they pretend to proue in their resolution, that the Angels may in one instant be in diuerse places, whē we vnderstande their reasons, they shalbe answered.

Their speache deliuereth absurditie, to saie, that a Bodye being dispoiled of his Dimensions, forbeares not for all that to be a Body: For if it happened that a substance Corporall were wholy dispoiled of his dimēsions, it should be no more a Body, but a substance not Corporal, & of like nature to the Angelles and Spirites. And albeit God by his power may separate the Dimensions of a substance, withoute corrupting it, yet it cannot be, but they muste be separated from a Bodye, without corrupting the same: bicause the Qualities and Dimensions be Accidentes of the Substance, but not of the Body, which cannot subsiste without them, bicause they are of his proper Essence.

And where the Doctours inferre after in their obiection, that the weight in a body is a thing essential: the Ministers denie it, and by this reason, if it were of the Essence of the Bodye, the Bodye failing, it muste also cease to be. And yet we see, that the Body of Jesus Christ glorified (to the which the bodyes of all the Electe shalbe conformed after the Resurrection) dothe not forbeare to be and subsiste, albeit at this

this kaye it be exempt from al weightinesse.

Touching theire moste strong and mighty Argumente, that if tw Bodyes maye be together in one place, one body may also be in diuers places at one instant, the Ministers, without graunting theire Antecedente, saie, theire Consequence (vnder correction) is not good, as the Argumente it selfe is moste weake. Adding this further that the Doctoures, neither haue proued, nor euer can proue by Scripture, nor any Authoritie of the Auncientes, no nor any sufficiente Reason, that either the matter of theire Antecedente, or the Consequence they inferre vppon it, are true.

Where the Doctoures, to proue that two bodyes may be together in one place, alleage scripture, that Christe entred the house where his disciples were, the dores being shutte, the Ministers aunswere, that it is not written that he entred by the dores shutte, but onely the dores being shutte, whiche the Auncient Interpreter hath giuen well to vnderstande, expounding in one of the places of S. Iohn (where standes mention of the matter afore recited) *Cum Fores essent clausæ*, When the dores were shutte came Iesus &c. Yet the Ministers saie, they beleue and are assured of the cleare opinion of the Scripture, that the dores being shutte he came, and stode in the middest of his Disciples: But that it cannot be defined nor determined whiche waye he entred, whether throughe the Walles, or by the Gates of Wode: whiche S. Hilarie him selfe puttes in doubte in his place alleaged by the Doctours: what soeuer it be, the Ministers say, that in entring he made his way myraculously, & y one body (whether it were the wod or the wal) made place to the body of Iesus Christ entring: or that an opening was made to him by the Aungel, who opened & shut the dores againe in a moment, as hath bene said before. But in what fashion so euer it was done, two bodyes were neuer founde together in one selfe place.

Touching that they alleage of S. Augustine in his Booke de Agone Christiano, that Christe entred by the dores, wee

dente

denie not but that he entred not by the dores, but onely that two bodyes haue bene euer together in one selfe place: that if Iesus Christe entred by the dores, the dores at his entrie gaue him place, as is saide.

Where the Doctours alleage touching the suspitiō of the Apostles, that it was a vision, it apperteines nothing to the present matter, nor also that they maruelled of the manner of his entry, which e was myraculous, as hath bene alwayes confessed to them.

And where they adde after in the opinion that the ancient Heretikes had of the Body of Iesus Christe, that it was not true, and that he did things aboue nature: the Ministers tell them, that thei some what suppose what occasion and ground of their errour the auncient Fathers had presented to them, if they had confessed that which the Doctours do prefer and defende obstinately of the Bodye of Iesus Christe: that he doth things not onely aboue nature, but also against nature, and against the wil and ordinance of God. And there is no doubte, but such an opinion was a greate preiudice to Marcion and other Heretikes that haue denied the true Humanitie of Iesus Christe, if by the examples of the Doctours it were confessed, that the Body of Iesus Christe (against the truth, nature, and essence of a Body) may be at one time in diuerse places, or in one place together with an other body.

To that which they alleage of Iustinus Martyr, the Ministers answere, that the Booke they haue alleaged is falsely attributed to him: for it handles a mention of Origen (Ad Quæstion) and yet Origen was more than an hundred yeres after him.

And touching the opinion of the Graue, mentioned in the place they haue produced, it is answered, that the Euangelist doth clearely expresse, that there was greate trembling of the earthe when he rose againe, and that the Angel rolled away the stone that closed the Graue, with the whiche consents Leo the first Bishop of Rome, writing to the Bishops of Palestina, where he saithe, that Iesus rose, the stone that couered the Sepulchre being rolled awaye.

Touching

Touching the place of S. Hilarie alleaged by the Doctors, there is one worde whiche maye suffice for their aunswere, and expresselye spoken by the saide holy Doctour, that Jesus Christe, to whom all things are open (as the Doctours haue expounded the said sentence) or (according to the exposition of the Ministers) who makes way through al, by his Diuine vertue entred the doores being shut, by which he giues sufficiently to vnderstand, that to enter into the house where his disciples were, he made himself way & opening, neither can we conclude otherwaies by that which he hath written, but that his entry was myraculous.

Touching S. Ambrose vpon S Luke alleaged by the Doctors, there can be no more inferred than S. Hilary hath said: neither can there be other conclusion either of the one or other, but that Jesus entred into the House by a Diuine and wonderful vertue.

Where they alleage of S. Iohn Chrysostome touching the Virgyn, ỳ Christ came out of her wombe, & yet her virginity & integrity was no way corrupted or defiled, yea & shee remained a Virgyn before & after her deliuery, the Ministers beleue it, confesse it, & teache it, yelding their reason by the scripture, because shee neuer knewe man.

But if thereupon they wil inferre that in the birth of Jesus Christ, *Nulla intercesserit aperitio vteri*, the Ministers say, that such conclusion should be against the expresse text of the scripture, & also the opinion of S. Luke in suche behalfe, *Omne masculinũ adaperiens vuluam &c.* besides the authority of many ancient Authours approuing no lesse, as Origen vpon S. Luke, Tertullian de Carne Christi, S. Ierome in his first tome ad Eustochium, whose expresse speach is, that Christe came out ỳ wombe of the Virgyn *Clausam*, by which appeares that the Virgyn was a true Virgyn, & also a true mother.

To the authority which they alleage of S. Ierome, the Ministers for aunswere retourne onely his owne saying, that when Jesus came where his Disciples were, the Creature obeied his Creatour.

The allegation whiche the Doctoures drawe out of Cy-

rill, serues nothing to confirme their matter.

Touching the Heresie, whiche S. Augustine iustely comprehendes in Iouinian, who to eschue the errour of the Manicheans, fell into an other, as saying the Virgyn remained not a Virgyn in the deliuery. The Ministers aunswere, it was not necessary, that Iouinian, to escape the errour of the Manicheans, should cal to doubte the Virginitie of Mary: because the ground of that standes vpon this, that she was neuer knowne of man.

Touching the Conclusion whiche the Doctours woulde drawe of the saide Authorities, and accommodate them to their pourpose (that one bodye maye be in twoo places at one instante, or that twoo bodyes maye be together in one place) the Ministers saie, that is altogether impertinente, and that thei cannot any wayes inferre it of the place which they haue alleged, nor others which they can gather, neither that it can be found in any good Authour. By meane whereof they conclude against the Doctours, that as their ground is nothing, so they goe about falsely to authorize their errour by the name & titles of the Ancients, as not vnderstanding & taking rightly ỳ phrase to penetrate, which certaine authors haue vsed: which signifieth not a confusion or medling of diuers bodies occupying one self place, but only the yelding ỳ one makes to an other to giue him place as we se & proue in experience, that the ayre giues place to a man that walkes, & to byrdes that fly. For cõclusion the Ministes say, that, that which they propose & mainteine for their aunswere doth not derogate or diminish in any thing the greatnesse, glory, & power of God, but establisheth & aduanceth it much more than such prodigious absurdities as the Doctors prefer, & seke to persuade without any reason or meane probable: for thei cõfesse, that all that happened, both in Christes entry into the house where his disciples were, & the going out of the same, as also the womb of his mother, & the graue, was a wonderful & Diuine vertue of God. But they denye for all that, that any thing happened which was impossible, & conteined any contradiction. The matters which they alleage of Cal-

uin

vin & Beza are things frivolous, and proponed rather to reproch and impugne, than to search and cleare the truth.

And where they saie, that all Antiquitie in one accorde hath understande by the terme Aphantos apanton, that Jesus Christ made himself invisible to his disciples remaining in their presence, the Ministers, to answere them, alleage one authoritie of S. Ambrose upon S. Luke, who preferring these wordes, saithe, he withdrewe himselfe from them, and an other of Nicholas de Lyra, whose opinion uppon this place is, that it was done by the agilitie of his glorious body, which might sodainely vanishe.

Touching that which they alleage of the penetration of heauens, whē Christ mounted thither, the Ministers answer, that it is likely they did divide & were open, as at ẏ baptisme of our Saviour Christ, the piller descended upon him, & also when S. Stephen was stoned.

Touching that they reprehend in the first answere of the Ministers, that in the 12. chap. of the Actes, there is no mention made of the opening of the prison: the Ministers referre them to reade the text of the said place diligently, where thei find, that after he had passed the first & second watch, the last gate of the prison which was of yron, opened of it selfe to the Angel and S. Peter, to make them place.

Where the doctors reply upon the Ministers answers, to the argument of the Camel, inferred in their first answere: the Ministers auouch the integritie of their said answere, as to conteine nothing against Gods worde: but say, that they are beguiled, as referring that to ẏ Camel, which ought not to be understande but of the saluation & conuersion of Riche men only, wherof was mention made before: for our Lorde Jesus Christ in saying that, that which is impossible to men, is possible to God, pretends no other thing, thā to answer to the question proposed by his disciples, which is, who might be saued: whereunto he answered, that, that truely was impossible to men, who of them selues are inclined to trusse in theire Riches, but it was possible to God, as to be able to drawe theire hartes from that vaine confidence.

Touching the argumente which they would ground vpon the presence of Iesus Christe in the Supper (which they would inferre to be in diuerse places) the Ministers confesse the Antecedent, and denie the Consequence. For they haue no doubte but by faithe our Lorde Iesus Christe is spiritually present in the Supper to all the Faithful, by which we must not inferre that he is there Locally, Diffinitiuely, or Corporally: which where they say, it is not imaginable, the Ministers answere it, as in regarde of suche as are not taught and lightened by the Spirite of God, and haue no other imagination, than that which their natural facultie giues them. But to such as being lighted by Gods grace, haue a true and liuely faith in their hartes, it is no more impossible to represent vnto them Iesus Christe crucified in the Supper, than it was to the Galatheans to represent and repose him vnto them as present and visible in the preaching of S. Paule: and to those likewise of whom S. Cyprian makes mention in his Sermon of the Supper, that in celebrating it, they embrace the Crosse of Iesus Christe, sucke his Bloud, and fyre their tongue within his woundes: all which things are done by liuely contemplation and apprehension of Faithe, which is no other thing than a substaunce of things hoped for, and a demonstration of suche as are inuisible, as S. Paule defines it.

Touching the truth of the thing conioined with his signes and Sacramentes, the Ministers confesse, that outwarde signes are neuer without their effecte on the behalfe of the Faithful, who cannot participate with the Bread and Wine distributed in the Supper, but forthwith they participate with the Flesh of Iesus Christe crucified for their sinnes, and with his Bloud shedde, to ratifie the newe Allyaunce which God hath made with his people. But if the Doctours would inferre thereupon a Corporal Presence in the Supper, the Ministers would denie it, and that by this reason, that such presence was not required of the ancient Fathers: who notwithstanding did not forbeare to eate one selfe same foode with al the faithful of this day, as (with the helpe

of

of God) shall be more amplie declared, when it pleaseth the Lord of Neuers to commaund conference of that matter.

Where the Doctours, reprochyng the Ministers, say that they attribute to themselues humaine power, more than to the power of God, as saying that by Faithe they make present, things that are absent: seing God (according to the doctrine of the ministers) can not bring to passe that one body be in diuers places at one instant. The sayd Ministers Aunswere that suche Antitheſis are folish and not to purpose, and that there is farre greater likelihode, that the Doctors presume more of their power, and the other Bishops of the Romishe churche, than of the power of God: For God hath not created by his worde, but heauen, earthe, and the other creatures contained therein, and they in their creation attribute to themselues the power to Create their Creator, as appeareth in their Breuarie, where the Priest sayth, *qui creauit me, creatur mediante me.* The Ministers also do greatly marueil, that the Doctors cal the vertue of Faith, humaine power, seing the great and wonderful effectes of the same, reuealed to vs in so many Examples of the Scriptures, specially in the eleuenth to the Hebrues, where S. Paule sayethe, that the holy ones by Faithe haue vanquished kingdomes. &c. All which things doe not surmount the vertue only, but also the capacitie of humaine vnderstanding.

The Doctors replie that foloweth this Article, containes but numbers of vnprofitable and superfluous wordes, and but little or nothing of necessary matter: And that the ministers haue more particularely Aunswered to euery pointe which they repeate, they sende them effsones to the former aunsweres, with this request, not to serue them hence forewarde with one messe twice.

Touching the sacrament of the Altare, as they call it, the ministers neither receiue nor approue in any sort that their Masse which they pretend to be a sacrament, is a sacrament, and muche lesse a sacrifice, by the which remission of sinnes may be any way obtained: yea they say, that both the sacrificature, and sacrifice by them pretended, with all things de-

pending theruppon, be blasphemies and impieties, by which God is dishonored, all the benefites of Iesus Christe buried, and Christes church seduced and abused, as shall clearely appeare by the pursute of the conference. Neither doe the Ministers corrupt in any sort either the sense or words, which Iesus Christ vsed in the Institution of the holy supper.

## The Replie or Obiection of the Doctoures, against the Aunsvvere of the Ministers, *touching the Article of Gods omnipotencie: being on Saterday the xx. of Julie.*

THe Doctoures say, that this consequence, God can not bring to passe of his omnipotencie, that one body be in two places at one instants, and therfore he is not almightie, is so good & strong, that the Ministers can not any way denie it, without falling more and more into erecrable blasphemies, to the great greefe and horroure of the said Doctoures: wherin besides the two blasphemies which they maintaine in their former Answeres (that it is impossible to God to make a body be in two places, as also impossible to him to will to doe it:) in this first Article of their last Answer, they bring forthe foure or fiue other blasphemies, wheron do hang also diuers others, bisides the absurdities, falshoodes, & imputations which they haue heaped vpon the Doctors: in the first place they alleage that God can not do a thing to derogate y order which he hath established in the world: in the seconde that it were to establishe mutabilitie and chaunge in Gods councels to confesse that he is able to doe any thing contrary to the said order established in the world: in the third, that if it were so, there should be contradiction in his will, wherof should folow that he were a lier: And for the fourth blasphemie, that the power of God is his will, and likewise his not

power

power his not wil: And for the fifth they pretende that God would haue a body, which in one instant might haue bene in many places, afore they beleue that God could haue made it: otherwayes they meane to infer that he neither hath, could, nor can make it: by which the Ministers will acknowledge nothing of Gods power, but so muche as he shewes by effect, for which matter they alleage Tertullian. All these blasphemies are drawne out of the proper wordes of the first Article of the Ministers.

Touching the firste, that God can not doe a thing to derogate the order he hath established in the worlde, it is proued an apparant blasphemie by the Scripture, who in infinite places makes mention of Gods works aboue nature, which the Ministers call order established in the world: the Scripture teacheth in proper termes ý God can do infinite things aboue the order established in the world: As the wife of Lot which was conuerted into a piller of Salte: that a barraine woman in hir last age, hauing an olde husband, had a childe: That a Vine all drie, hathe flourished: A shée Asse hath spoken: that the Sunne stayed and went backe againe, with other innumerable Examples contained in the olde Testament. And for the new Testament, ý a virgin brought forth a childe: That a body hath walked vpon the Sea, and mounted to heauen: and generally all the miracles done by Christ and his Apostles aboue nature, the same being contrary to the order established in the worlde. From this blasphemie growes an other, that God séeing he hathe established his order in the world, hath not done, nor coulde, nor can doe any miracle.

But to proue by the Authoritie of the scripture, that God can do against the order established in the world: it is writte in Esay. 50. My hand (which is my power) is it abridged ý I can not redéeme & buy againe: is there no more power in me to deliuer: Behold by threates I wil make dry the sea, & wil put the fludes into the deserte, so that the fishes shal perishe for wante of water, and shal die of thirste: I apparel the heauens with darkenesse, and putte a sacke for their couer.

But

But more expressely in the newe Testamente, where it is saide by S. Iohn, that God can raise children to Abraham of the stones: Which place albeit may be expounded Allegorically, yet by the literall sense S. Iohn declares it was possible to God: the Deuil knewe and hath confessed, that if Christe were the true sonne of God, he might transforme stones into breade: The same notwithstanding contrary to the order established in the worlde. And we haue to note ỳ there is no lesse impossibilitie that bread be turned into Flesh by Gods omnipotencie, than a stone transnatured into bread: Wherin for such as denie this last, done by the power of God, they declare that they beleeue lesse of the almightinesse, than Deuilles.

The confuting of the seconde blasphemie, dependes vpon the disproofe of the first: for albeit, God, contrary to the order established in the world, hath done many miracles (as hathe bene recited here before) yet there is no mutabilitie or chãge in his Counsell.

Touching the third blasphemie, that if God did any thing contrary to the order established in the worlde, there shoulde be contradiction in his will, and therfore he should be a lier: The Doctoures Obiecte that it would folowe, that suche should be the will of God, neuer to doe any thing against the order established in the world, and that he wold haue stayed, and declared ỳ to be his will, by his worde: For otherwayes it coulde not haue bene knowne what was Gods will. And as the ministers neither haue, nor can make appeare by Gods worde, that suche is Gods wil, as not to do any thing against the order established in the world, so they must first teache and instructe that suche is Gods will afore they conclude that if God made one body to be in two places (or other thing) against the order of Nature established in the world, he should be a lier.

Touching the fourth blasphemie, that Gods power is his will, and that his impower is his vnwill: According to the sense which the ministers giue it (if God can not doe but what he will), to be an Heresie of the Heretikes called Monarchians

narchians in the primitiue Church: against whom Tertullian writes in his booke *aduersus praxeam*, and since renued by one Petrus Abaillardus, and continued by one VVickleffe: they in deede measured Gods power according to his will, the same contrary to the expresse word of God, which oftentimes declars many things to be possible to God, which notwithstanding he wil not doe, as appeareth in Sap. 2 where it is recited that God could sende many sortes of afflictions to the children of *Israel* to chastise them, but he would not doe it, hauing disposed all things by measure, number, and ballance, and that he might destroy suche as had offended him, but he would not, but vsed mercy to them: In the gospel, our Lorde saide to S. Peter: Thinkest not thou that I can pray to my Father, and he will sende me more than twelue legions of Aungels, and yet as he would not pray to him: so his Father did not send them, although he was able to haue done it in the persone of his sonne: Christe might haue let his enimies to haue taken away his life, but he would not: And the Father might haue saued him from corporall Deathe (saithe S. Paule) by his power, but neither the one nor other would doe it: which albeit the ministers might say was foreordained, yet the Scripture holdes expresselye that he might haue done it, notwithstanding it was foreordained.

And touching the authoritie of Tertulhan, the Doctoures are glad they produce it, as making altogither for the truthe againste their blasphemies, and yet they haue omitted many of his wordes and sentences to confute their errour, as the text it selfe here witnesseth. *Nihil Deo difficile, Quis hoc nescit? & impossibilia apud seculum, possibilia apud deum, quis ignorat? Et stulta mundi elegit Deus vt confundat sapientia. Ergo inquiunt heretici (monarchiani scilicet) difficile non fuit Deo ipsum se & patrem & filium facere, aduersus traditam formam rebus humanis. Nam & sterilem parere contra naturam, difficile Deo non fuit, sicut nec virginem: plane nihil Deo difficile: sed si tam abrupte in presumptionibus nostris hac sententia vtamur, quidnis de Deo confingere poterimus: quasi fecerit quia facere potuerit: Non autem quia omnia potest facere, ideoque credendum*

*est illum fecisse etiam quod non fecerit: sed an fecerit requirendum. Potuit (ita saluus sum) Deus pennis hominem ad volandum instruxisse (quod & melius) præstitit, non tamē quia potuit, statim & fecit: potuit & præceam & omnes pariter hæreticos statim extinxisse non tamen quia potuit, extinxit: oportebat enim miluos esse & hæreticos: oportebat & patrem crucifigi. Hac ratione erit aliquid & Deo difficile, id scilicet quod non fecerit, non quia non potuerit, sed quia noluerit: etenim posse, velle est, & non posse, nolle.*

By which texte may easily be sene according to Tertullian, that God can doe many things which he will not doe, as to make a man to flie, but dothe it not, he can destroy the heritikes, & yet sparcs them, bicause he wil not do all he cā do.

And touching their conclusion of the saide place of Tertullian (that the power of God is his will, & his impower likewise his vnwill) they wel declare their sleight examination of the meaning of that place: for Tertullian saith it not of his owne sentence (considering he should conclude againste that he had saide afore) but he inferres it against the Monarchian heretikes: who held, that what God might do, he would do, and it was done: By which reason Tertullian concludes againste them, that what God had not done, muste nēdes be hard and impossible to him: so that according to those Heretikes, it was all one to be done, and might be done: and not to be done, as muche as to be impossible to God: And of that (as Tertullian inferreth) would folowe, that the power, the will, and the dēde of God, should be all one, and of the contrary, a thing not to be done, and to be impossible to God to do it, should also be all one: And euen so also would be al one, the power of God and his will, and his impower and his vnwill: which Tertullian concludes for an absurd thing proceeding of the opinion of the saide Monarchian Heretikes, and not of his sentence, which was altogither contrary: wherin as we sē the ministers consent in opinion with the said Monarchian Heretikes, which Tertullian refutes, so the moste euident prowe standes in the fifthe blasphemie. And for conclusion against the said blasphemies, the Doctoures declare, that God can doe much more than he wil doe, and more than he

he hath established in the world: for otherwayes woulde folowe yet other blasphemies, as this, that the power of God should not be infinite, but limitted: An other, that for necessitie, all things should be done in the world, bicause God could not otherwayes doe, than entertaine the order established in the world: which Caluine himselfe detestes, saying: that God of his omnipotencie chaungeth and altereth the order established, as it séemes good to him, and to thinke otherwayes, were to limite his power and prouidence.

Where the ministers say in their saide first Article, ẏ the auncient Doctors of the churche denied the omnipotencie of God: it is a most manifest falshoode & great wrong: for they deny it not, but interprete the scripture which séemes to deny it, and so giue to vnderstād how it ought to be taken: that much lesse by the same scripture well vnderstanded, there is any exception at al suffred against the almightinesse of God, séeing that in the contrary, it is confirmed as S. Augustine saithe in his fifth Booke *de Ciuitate Dei. Cap. 10.* Gods power (saithe he) is in nothing diminished, when it is saide, he can not die, nor be deceiued: For he can not suche things, bicause if he coulde them, his power shoulde be lessened: concluding that he can not doe things which are of infirmitie, bicause he is almightie.

Uppon the ende of the first Article, the ministers chalenge vs, as saying their difference is that we mainteine a body to be in many places, bicause God can do it: and that of the contrary, the ministers holde that it is not in Gods power to do so, bicause he wil not: The doctors declare that for their part, they neuer concluded to be true, that a true body was in two places, bicause God could do it.

But the Question was only to know if God could doe it, to come afterwardes by order to proue by Scripture, that he wold do it: they haue already heretofore recited the scripture of the supper and the Ascension, adding withall the Doctrine of Caluine touching the said supper, to shewe that Gods will is to bring to passe, that a body be in two places (as in déede it is) according to the expresse woorde of God.

Besides, we haue produced to the same end the scriptures of the dayes being thus, of the birth of our Lord, and of the Resurrection thorow the stone, which be like deedes and of the selfe reason to one body in many places: Of the contrary, the ministers to deny the will of God, and depraue holy Scripture (which sheweth that suche is Gods will, that a body be in diuers places) alleage not any thing more instantly, than the impossibilitie of God to doe it. But to the ende that al the world vnderstande the difference betweene vs, we presently declare, that there hathe bene no other difference touching this Article vntill now, but to knowe whether it be in Gods power to bring to passe that a body be in two places at one instant or not.

And for the second Article, the Doctors say, the Ministers Answere not to the matter: For the Obiection was not, if quantitie were accidente of a Mathematical body, *aut de predicamento quantitatis*, (as the philosophers hold) but to know if it were of the essence and necessitie to the quantitie of a body to be circumscript and enclosed in place. And touching S. Augustine alleaged by the Ministers, he speakes expressely according to the proprietie of the diuine nature and corporall nature, saying: that the Diuine nature is euery where, but not the corporall, as of his naturall proprietie requiring a certaine place: whereof the Doctoures make no difficultie, according to the saide naturall propertie. But the Question is, if aboue nature by Goddes omnipotencie, it may not be that a body be without place equall to his greatnesse, the same beingopenly cõfessed by S. Augustine when he speakes *De clarsis Iaonis*, hauing no longer regarde to the nature of things, but to the power of God: And we coulde wishe, that the ministers woulde alleage this Epistle of S. Augustine against the Doctrine of Caluine and his Ministers, as often as they alleage the terte of the place of bodies against the power of God, touching the body of Iesus Christe in the Sacrament.

Touching the third Article, the ministers are abused: for according to the Philosophers and natural reason of bodies,

(whiche the Ministers folowe) *Locus est superficies Corporis continentis*, by which if the highe and laste Heauen were circumscript of place, there must nedes be an other body aboue the highe and furste Heauen, *a qua primum Cælum contineretur. & sic in infinitum.* For the rest, the Ministers giue no answere to the other obiections made vpon this Article.

Touching the places of Scripture which they alleage to proue that there are places aboue the Heauens, they do paraphrase and abuse the ambiguitie of the name of a Place. For in al their speache of the dimension of Bodyes (whiche thei say doth necessarily require a place equal to their greatnesse) they must meane Corporall places, as the dimension of bodyes demaunde.

And now when they speake of places aboue Heauen, they must understande meane thē otherthan Corporal, as not being such places, or like to those wherin our bodyes be heard, but places incomprehensible and imaginable, where bodies and Spirites are indifferent, without distinction of certaine spaces and places Corporall, for their greatnesse: in whiche places the Rule of ỳ Ministers is false, by which they mainteine that one body cannot be in one place, if it conteine not roumth according to the greatnesse of the body: for the resse we saie, the manner of Heretikes is, to interprete the Scriptures spiritually, when they should take them according to the Letter: and of the contrary to expounde by the Letter, that which oughte to be vnderstanded spiritually and by figures: as the Ministers expounde the house of God in the other world Literally and Corporally, as to conteine spaces and Corporall habitations, diuerse, and separated one from an other, albeit it oughte to be vnderstanded spiritually, for the diuersitie of degrées of beatitude: neither can the Doctours here omitte one manifest contradiction of the Ministers in this Article, wherein they pretende that the Bodies and Soules of the blessed, are lodged aboue al the Heauens, and yet they lodge the Bodye of Iesus Christe within Heauen.

And touching the Article condemned by the Facultie of

the Diuines of Paris, we answer, that it is an ordinarie vse with the Ministers to alleage Authorities, either corrupt or improper. For the Article saithe, that the Bishop of Paris hauing assembled the Facultie, condemned all suche as would mainteine two seuerall Heauens, the one for Aungelles, and the other for the soules of men, whiche apperteines nothing to the present question.

In the fourth Article the Ministers impose vpon the Doctoures, who neuer attribute the propertie of God to any creature, and haue saide many times before, that to be euerywhere, and incircumscript, was not naturall to any creature, but onely to God. Wherein the Authoures alleaged by the Ministers (as S. Basil, Dydimus, and Vigilius) speake not otherwayes than of the propertie of Nature, to be euerywhere or not, and yet denie not that it is in Gods power, to bring to passe that a creature or bodye be in two or many places aboue his nature, but (as hath bene saide) when they come to the power of God, many of those ancient authours confesse it to be possible to God, and that he hath done so in the Sacrament, and therfore the Ministers answer is out of the matter, seeing al the contention is but of Gods power, & not of natural properties.

In this fifth Article the Ministers haue not rightly comprehended the reason of the Doctours, who haue not alleaged that Aungelles are circumscripte naturally as well as bodyes: by whiche they woulde inferre, that the circumscription of place simply depended not as of the only & essential cause of the dimensions of a body, as by al their said reasons, the Ministers pretende: notwithstanding the Doctours are not ignorant, that, to put difference betwene corporall and spiritual creatures, there is a custome in the schole to distinguish ỹ Angels *sunt diffinitiuè in loco*, & bodies *circũscriptiuè*.

In the sixth Article to satisfie the Doctours request to produce one only place or testimonie of the Ancients to proue it not in Gods power to make one body in two places. The Ministers for al the authorities they can haue, alleage falsly one place of S. Augustine where it is said (as is recited vpon

Gra-

Gratian de Consecratione Distinct. 2. C. Prima quidem) that S Augustine wrote that it muste be that Christes body be in one place: whereunto the Doctours answere, that it is not so set downe in the proper text of S. Augustine, which is in the 30. Treatise vpon S. Iohn: the tenure being thus in all the ancient exemplaries of S. Augustine, *Corpus Domini in quo resurrexit vno loco esse potest, Veritas eius vbique diffusa est:* Here is no *Oportet*, as the Ministers recite, hauing it of Gratian. And to the ende it be knowne that there oughte no greate truste to be had in the fragmentes of Gratian, without hauing recourse to the exemplaries of S. Augustine. In the title of the Canon, there be these wordes drawne out of the Exposition of S. Augustine vppon the 54. Psalme, from whence he drawes the onely beginning of his Canon, and yet he brings it not in as for truth: the residue of which Canon is taken of diuerse places of the saide S Augustine.

And albeit there were *Oportet*, yet S. Augustine vsing his custome, speakes according to the propertie of the Bodye, opposing the Diuinitie to the Humanitie, and toucheth not the operation of Goddes Omnipotencie: whereof when he doethe make mention, and that he speakes of the Sacramente, he affirmes expressely the Bodye of Jesus Christe to be in diuerse places by the Almightinesse of God, as wée hope to deduce aswell of him, as other Auncientes, in our resolution.

The eighth Article conteines many Errours againste Philosophie and Truthe: as first, in that they make no Distinction betweene a body called Mathematicall (whiche is) hauing dimension of largenesse, length, and height, and a bodye Physical or natural, that is, composed of a forme substantial, and matter, by the vnitie of which, it is made a body natural and substantial. In the second place, if the body should be without quantitie, yet would it differ from our soules separated, which be no substance materiall, and consequently it would differ also from Angels and Spirites.

In the thirde place, for conclusion of this Article, the Ministers declare plainly not to acknowledg any substantiall

Body.

Body. And where they saie, that if God could separate the dimensions of a substance, and not corrupte it, that that substance should remaine spirituall, as the Angells, they are abused: for that substance shoulde not remaine immateriall, as our Soules and Angelles do, which be not capable of dimensions, and therefore shoulde be still differente from Angels and our Soules.

To the ninth Article, the Ministers answere nothing to pourpose: for the Doctours holde not, that grauitie & weight are essentialles in a body, but to encline downeward is essential to the beautifie & weight of a body: thei demaunded also in their obiection, if an Earthely body and weighty, remaining in his substance and natural beautifie, coulde not by Goddes almightinesse, be suspended on highe, but that it must encline downwarde, notwithstanding it were against his nature and inclination.

For the rest, touching the answere to many Articles concerning twoo bodyes to be in one place, and the places of Holy Scripture and Anciente Authoures produced by the Doctours (to proue that it was in Goddes power to make twoo bodyes to be in one onely place) and by the like reason, that it was also in the same power to bring to passe, that one body (of the contrary) be in twoo places, we saie, for the firste, that the Ministers do wrong to denie this Consequence, twoo bodyes maie be in one place by Goddes power, then of the contrary, one bodye by the same power maye be in twoo places: for there is almuche repugnancie of Goddes order established in the one as in the other, and no lesse contradiction in nature grounded vpon one cause and reason, which is, in the limitation and circumscription of a bodye: to the whiche as itis naturall to be in place, so is it natural to him to be in place proportioned, and correspondent to his dimensions. And if for the number of diuerse places where one body were, it might be inferred, that it were no more a body (as implying contradiction) euen by the same reason according to one onely place, where were many bodyes, it coulde not be inferred that they were no more bodyes, than many

bodyes

bodyes were one, whiche woulde implie like contradiction to the firste.

And where the Ministers denie the Antecedent, which is, that twoo bodyes maye be in one place, we haue produced to proue it, the text of the dores being shut, the byrth of the body of our Lord of the Virgyn, the comming out of ỹ Sepulcher, the passage of a Camell through the creuis of a Needle, & the penetration of the heauens, which Iesus made at his Ascension: and bicause they deny these doings conteined expressely in the holy scripture, interpreted by the antient Christians, & depraue it at their pleasure, the Doctoures auouch againe vpon the textes of those Scripture, as followeth.

Firste touching the dores shutte, S. Iohn saithe, that Iesus is come: he meanes to the place where his Disciples were: neither came he thither without entring, for that wer a more greate myracle to be in the middest of them without entring, than to enter there simply. In the seconde place it is saide, *Cum fores essent clausæ*, or *ianuis clausis*, which is to say, he entred the dores being shutte: neither dothe it appeare, that the Scripture makes mentiõ rather of ỹ dores than of an other place, but to shewe on what part he entred. Thirdly the Scripture addes not in vaine, that the dores were shut, without saying that any opening was made myraculously, for it is alwaies saide, *quod venit ianuis clausis*. And if it were true that the dores had bene opened by Diuine vertue it shoulde be false, that our Lorde entred, *ianuis clausis*, for then shoulde he haue entred *ianuis apertis*, by what meanes so euer they had bene opened.

And to declare that the common consent of all the Auncientes hathe bene, that Iesus entred by the dores shutte, the Doctoures preferre foure fundations drawne oute of the Auncientes: In the firste they all confesse expressely, that the myracle of the entring was made in the Bodye of Iesus Christe. The seconde, that suche myracle was done aboue the nature of the Bodye, by the vertue of God. The thirde is, that expressely the Auncientes iudge, that in that

did consiste the myracle, that the bodye passed throughe the dores shutte, and was so with an other body.

And for the fourth fundation they adde, that in regarde of suche an entring, the Apostles taught, that the bodye of Jesus was no true bodye, but a Spirite or Vision, whiche the Ministers passe lightely withoute aunswere. But if it be so, that by Goddes power (as the Ministers holde) there was made an opening either by the dores, or other parte of the house, to giue entring to the bodye of Jesus Christe, then the myracle shoulde not consiste in the saide Bodye, but in the dores or other parte of the house whiche were opened, and yet there was nothing contrarie to the nature of the Bodye of our Lorde, for it resistes not any Bodye what so euer it be to enter by an opening made by myracle or otherwayes.

Be it that Iustine is not the Authour of the Questions against the Gentiles: yet it cannot be denyed that they were not of some Aunciente Christians of the Primitiue Churche: And the Doctoures haue attributed them to him, on whose name they be entituled: onely the saide Iustine in the place alleaged makes the myracle to haue passed in the Bodye of Jesus Christe, whiche being grosse and thicke, entred throughe the shutte dores, againste the nature of a Bodye by the power of God: and therefore the Apostles estæmed it to be a Vision by reason of an entry made withoute opening, as Spirites are wonte to enter. See the Texte.

S. Hilary dothe not onely saie, that he entred by the Omnipotencie of God, in what sorte so euer it be (as the Ministers seeke to turne and wrest his authoritie) but as one that had euen nowe to do with the Ministers, he repulseth and scoffes at al their euasions & subtilties, whiche they contriue of this doing. He saith he, that nothing gaue place to make opening to suche a bodye, neither loste he any thing of his substance, nor, to enter, was in nothing diminished. He addes that the dores, and all other openings were closed and faste barred,

barred, and yet in this lyeth the myracle, that the true natu-
rall body of Jesus Christe, againste his nature, by the Om-
nipotencie of God, entred a house faste closed and covered,
without any opening, by whiche he shewes apparantly that
the myracle consisted in the Body of Jesus Christe. Herein
we referre to the texte, which we desire to be wel examined
by the Ministers. S. Ambrose in the place recited saith, that
S. Thomas was abashed when he sawe the Bodye of Jesus
Christe enter. *Per innuia septa corporibus: & quod natura cor-
porea per impenitrabile Corpus sese infuderit inuisibili aditu.*
S. Chrysostome in the Homilie of S. Iohn Baptiste, and in
his Commentaries vppon the Gospell of S. Iohn saithe ex-
pressely, *Qui intrauit per ostia clausa non erat Phantasma,
non erat Spiritus, verè corpus erat. Quid enim dicitis respicite &
videte, quia Spiritus carnem & ossa non habet, quæ me habere vi-
detis? Habebat carnẽ, habebat & ossa, & clausa erãt omnia. Quo
modo clausis ostijs intrauerunt ossa & caro? clausa sunt omnia, &
intrat, quem intrantem non vidimus. Nescis quomodo factum sit,
& das hoc potentiæ Dei:* Where without difficultie S. Chry-
sostome as also S. Ambrose confesse the myracle to be done in
the Body of Jesus Christe, in that he passed through the shut
dores by the Omnipotencie of God.

S. Ierome in the place noted by the Doctors, writes mani-
festly that the body pierced the shut dores, euen as the Po-
etes persuade that ỹ sight of Lynceus pierced the wals with-
out opening, to see through. The said S. Ierome at that time
did argue vpon the nature of ỹ body, which the Bishop of Ie-
rusalem (infected with the Heresie of Origen) helde was not
true in Jesus Christ after his Resurrection, bicause he had
passed through the shut dores cõtrary to ỹ nature of a body:
to whõ S. Ierome (as also other ancients) persuades that that
are nothing derogates ỹ nature of the body, as proceeding of
a supernaturall vertue, affirming no lesse in his first Bookes
against Iouinian: in this phrase Jesus entred the dores being
shut: *quod humanorũ corporum natura non patitur.* And so with
others he puttes the myracle in the body of Jesus Christ.

It is moste true that S. Augustine in three Bookes at the

leaste dieth expresse opinion that this bodye passed throughe the shut doores, and that as the same was wrought by Gods power aboue the nature of Bodyes, so the Heretikes for all that ought not to denie the true Body of Jesus Christe: this he speakes in his Booke de Ciuitate Dei, besides his place de Agone Christiano, and the Epistle ad Volusianum already alleaged.

Epiphanius in his first Booke in the Heresie 20. and in the second Booke 64. againste the Origenistes, declares that it is but a spirituall bodye: meaning that he loseth nothing of his corporall substance, but changeth and draweth to him newe qualities and spirituall perfections conuenient to Spirites, as to passe throughe the walles without opening, giuing example of the bodye of Jesus Christe after his Resurrection, who pearced and passed throughe the doores being shutte: And so iudgeth (with others) that the myracle was done in the body of Jesus Christe, as pearcing the shutte doores, as a Spirite, albeit he was a true Body.

Cyrillus Alexandrinus determines also (with others) that this myracle happened in the body of our Lorde, who by the same wonder marched aboue the waters, contrary to the nature of a body by the power of God, reprehending al such as stode in any telous suspition that Christes body was not Naturall.

By al these authorities, the foure fundations afore proponed are true, and therefore it is too greate an impudencie to seeke to corrupt the intente and faithe of so many Auncients and Learned Christians, to introduce a confusion of newe interpretations. For besides the diuersitie of Caluin and Beza, the Ministers auouche two others, as first that the Angell opened the doore, as if Jesus had not had the power to open it himselfe, or had needed other opening. The other is, that he made his opening where he woulde: by which diuersities the Ministers giue open declaration, that they knowe not whereupon to reste: And (whiche worse is) they coulde not alleage one onely Auncient, as Authoure of their fiction, or that is contrary to all the other, since the Primitiue Church,

it

it serues them to nothing, to alleage that the iron dore in the Actes of the Apostles opened to S. Peter of himselfe, for the Doctors did neuer denie it: only we said that the Scripture spake not of the dores of the prisone: And if at the entrie of Iesus Christe, the dores had bene so opened, the Euangelist had as easily graunted it, as he said they were shutte, and as S. Luke said, that this dore of iron opened of himselfe.

There is no difficultie, that the firste that doubted of the body of Iesus Christ in this worlde, did not agree of the place touching the dores with the other Christians. And all be it they thoughte to serue and aide themselues with it, in the mainteining of their heresies (as with all the other miracles hapned in the body of Christe aboue nature) yet the Auncients neuer denied this facte, nor the other like to it, for feare to giue occasion of errour to the Heretikes, but they declared and distinguished what was the nature of the said body, and that which happed to him by the omnipotencie of God: The Christians for any heresie, did neuer abandon truthe: albeit the Heritikes haue sometimes abused it: But now seeing Christes body passed thorowe the dores without opening, it is certaine that two bodies haue bene in one place, and that they may be so: by which we haue well proued our proposition which without either scripture or auncient testimonie, the Ministers denie.

Touching the birth of Iesus Christe without breaking of the Virgine: we say that a great part of the Auncientes produced for the place of the dores, holde that this miracle also was done in the body of our Lord, and not in the body of the Virgine, sauing in that shee remained in hir integritie, without breaking or opening. And for their reason, the Auncients haue alleaged the scripture, *Ecce virgo concipiet & pariet*, and Ezechiel, *porta hæc clausa erit*, as also S. Ambrose recites in his Epistle. 80. wherin is contained a councel which S. Ambrose did assist, determining againste Iouinian and other heritikes, that virginitie and integritie remained in the mother of God in hir deliuerie, S. Augustine repeating the same in the place alleaged by the Doctoures in his first Booke against Iulian,

Chap. 2. And where the ministers say, that the virgin should not haue lost hir virginitie, though our Lord had issued out as other men doe, in this they are condemned of heresie by the Auncients, who note Iouinian to derogate the virginitie, as holding opinion with the ministers: to whom the Doctors make this question, what miracle they would acknowledge in the birthe of our Lord as touching his body, and the virginitie of his mother, if he came from hir as other men do from their mothers, as the Ministers write. And touching that which they alleage of Tertullian, Origen, S. Ambrose, & S. Ierome, the Doctors say that Tertullian and Origen, held suche heresie and many others, which were reproued afore Iouinian, & of this they haue bin cõdemned with him & his consorts. But for the respecte of S. Ambrose, it is apparant, that he beleeued the contrary, as wel by the Councel which he assisted, as by that which he writes in his Booke *de institutione Virginis*: wherin we haue to interprete his wordes, that *Christus vulvam aperuerit*, not that it was by breaking, but by effects of generation and production of his true body out of the bellie of his mother by miracle and vertue supernaturall: in suche sorte, that euen as his Conception was miraculous, so also was his birthe. And *aperire vulvam* is a phrase and manner of speache in the Scripture, as to say and name the firste borne, in what sort he might haue bene borne. And touching S. Ierome he saithe nothing of the breaking, but only that the body came out bloudie as he was in the wombe of his mother, & to be bloudy is not required breaking of the mother. For conclusion of this Article, we would willingly aske the Ministers, if they holde as an Article of Faithe the virginitie of the mother after hir deliuerie: and if they can proue it by expresse and inreprocheable worde of God written, bicause Beza calles in doubte these two poyntes at his pleasure, and the Religion pretended reformed, amongste other Articles of Faith of their diuers confessions imprinted, recites sometime the Virginitie of the mother of God after hir deliuerie, and sometimes it is omitted. And in some Confessions is brought in no more but that Iesus was borne of the virgine

Marie,

Marie, and only issued of the seede of Dauid.

The Doctoures applie for the Resurrection and issuing of Christes bodye thorowe the stone of the Sepulchre, the moste parte of the Authorities alleaged by them vppon the dores shut, as the absolute reading of the saide Authorities (will make Faithe) togither with Gregorius Nazianzene in his tragedie of the Passion of our Lord, who ioynes (as many other Auncients) these three miracles hapned in the body of our Lord aboue nature, the birth without breaking the virgine, the resurrection thorowe the stone, and his entrie thorowe the dores shutte. We say also that Caluine and Beza make conscience to ioyne with the Ministers that oure Lorde rose not againe, the Sepulchre being closed and shut, yea they had rather fall into the friuolous absurdities, and vaine Expositions heere afore alleaged, than discende into the opinion of the Ministers, bicause there is more Testimonie in the texte of the Gospell, that Jesus was risen afore the stone was rolled away by the Aungell, as the moste parte of the Auncient Christians doe consent: which meane also giues occasion to beleeue more easily the Resurrection of our Sauioure, than if the stone had bene taken away before his Resurrection, for so it mighte haue bene more easily sayde, that the bodie was transported, and not raised or risen: neither dothe the Texte beare that the Aungell rolled away the stone afore the Resurrection, or when Jesus did rise or rather after, as is greate likelihode in Scripture, in reason, and all Antiquitie. Pope Leo is euill alleaged by the Ministers, as concealing that is written in his Epistle touching the shutte dores, as also producing euill the matter of the Resurrection: for it is not sayde, that our Lorde did rise after the stone of the monumente was rolled awaye: But it is sayde againste the fantastike sorte, that the substance putte on the Crosse, and that which rested in the Sepulchre, and likewyse that whiche rose againe the thirde day, the stone of the Monumente being rolled awaye, is the true Flesche of Jesus Christe: By whiche speaches the Pope meanes not to saye that oure Lorde

did

did not rise afore the stone was reuersed, but only declares, that the body of Iesus Christ risen, was a true body, and not fantastical, whose Resurrection appeared by the opening of the monument: And this is the common interpretation of the Auncient authors, touching the reuersement of the stone. For ende of these Auncient testimonies, we maruel that the ministers seeing them so manifest and as conuinced, not only that God can bring to passe that two bodies be in one place, but also that he hath done it: dare reprochefully depraue the vnderstanding of the same, and yet they say that the reasons taken of suche and so euidente testimonies, are impertinent, Like as, by like licence (common with the Heritikes) they feare not, without any texte of the scripture, nor any place of the Ancients, to enterprete two bodies penetrating to be no other thing than one body to giue place to an other: of which false and licentious interpretacion, euen the common vse of speeche amongste the Philosophers, dothe condemne them: Like as also their fine example touching such as walke thorowe the aire which moues them, and the birdes when they flie, is farre to subtill: And where they vaunt in the sayde Article, that in denying two bodies to be able to be in one place by the omnipotencie of God, or one body in two places, they yet aduaunce and magnifie the power of God, the same is as true, as when in all other their erroures by whiche they oppugne Gods truthe, and blaspheme it, yet they bragge alwayes to aduaunce Gods glory: seeming hereby that they haue need to couer their filthinesse and deformitie with some cloke of speeche, the better to blinde the simple and ignorant.

The ministers haue also good reason, not to seeke to excuse the interpretacions of Caluine and Beza, as too friuolous, and yet they preferre their owne much more vaine before their Maisters: by which may be seene the agreement betweene the Maisters and Disciples, vsing all, the foundacion of their religion, which is to beleeue and preferre afore all others their particulare and priuate interpretacion and inspiration: where the Ministers say that the body of oure Lord was not inuisible to the disciples, of whome is spoken in S. Luke. 24.

But

but only ỹ hauing a swift body, was sodainly withdrawne, we Obiect that the sodaine departing which S. Ambrose and de Lyra speakes of, makes not that the body was inuisible, according to the Greeke worde aphantos, not signifying sodaine departure, but incapacitie to be seene and knowne: and so the text of the Scripture is apparantly for the Doctoures, as also, that as often as bothe the auncient and present Diuines giue example that Christ made himselfe inuisible, they alleage ordinarily this place.

The ministers, who vaunte to rest onely vppon the pure worde of God, for the exposition of the scripture, bring forthe their dreames grounded vppon their owne persuasion, as hath beene seene touching the doores being shutte: vsing the like licence to expounde the texte of S. Paule, which maintaines expressely that our Lorde pierced the Heauens: and they say that it is a likely truthe that the Heauens deuided and were open: And if they be asked from whence they fetch this interpretacion, their Answere is from Goddes worde grounded of their inwarde inspiration, by the which they accommodate the saying of S. Mathevve, that the Heauens were open when the Piller discended vppon oure Lorde, as thoughe all the Heauens were deuided, and that the spirite could not descend without the same were opened, being not aduised that the scripture in many places takes the Heauen for the aire. And where they alleage that S. Stephen sawe the Heauens open when he was stoned, it were more conuenient to the ministers to interprete such visions to be done in spirite, as there is great likelihode. Otherwayes two miracles must be confessed, the one in the Diuision of the Heauens, and the other, in that the sight of S. Stephen pierced not only into the Heauens, but also euen aboue: where the ministers confesse the body of Iesus Christe is vpon the righte hand of his Father, which S. Stephen saw: the same being against the order of God established in the worlde, by which it is necessary that there be a certaine difference betweene the eie seeing, and the thing which is seene: Neither is it lesse harde, that suche a thing be done, than that two bodyes be

penetrate: We must not forgette that oftentimes the scripture in the appearings and spirituall visions, vseth this language, that the Heauens were open, and yet in suche cases there was but spirituall vision, and likewise, but spirituall appearing: And as the Ministers seke to take the rigoure of the worde opening of the Heauens, euen so they must not note it straunge, if we wrest in like rigoure the penetration of the Heauens, specially in the Article of the Ascention, where is Question of the body of Iesus Christe, which had already pierced bodyes more impenetrable than the Heauen, which pointe of penetration of the Heauen, we referre to be more amplie handled an other time, as nowe to auoide tediousnesse.

Touching the eight and twentieth Article, where the ministers againste expresse scripture, defend obstinately, that God of his power can not bring to passe, that a Camell or Cable enter the eye of a nedle, we can not a little maruell bothe at their blindnesse, seeming to se nothing in the midde day, and at their frowarde obstinacie: By which, as we can not iudge, that they vnderstand not wel their fault, but sinne euen against their conscience, oppugning the truthe by them well knowne, so it seemes God suffereth this to happen to them in this text and place of the scripture so manifest, to the ende that by this Article the world may vnderstande howe farre more hardie they are to giue false vnderstandings of scriptures more obscure than this, yea in the matter of the Auncient Christians which are against them.

But to the ende the world vnderstand their great wrong, to denie that our Lorde can bring to passe, that a Camel (or cable) passe thorowe the hole of a nedle, we obiecte, that it were impossible to God to saue a riche man, vsing this Argument taken of the texte of the Gospell, it is more impossible or harde that God saue a riche man than to bring to passe that a Camel (or cable) passe thorow the hole of an Nedle: God can not bring to passe (of his omnipotencie (as the Ministers say) that a Camell enter the hole of a nedle, then he can

can not of his almightinesse make that a riche man be saued and enter into the kingdome of Heauen.

The *Maior* is of the Scripture, the *Minor* is confessed by the Ministers: and the consequence is necessary, and according to all Philosophie, he that can not doe the moste easiest can not doe the moste hardest.

The Auncientes also haue expounded without gainesaying, the present Scripture, as Origen in his Homilie vppon this place, saying: it is possible that a Camell enter the eie of a needle, not for all that, that it be possible as in respecte of men, but to God, like as the manner by which suche things may be done, is knowne to God, and his Sonne Iesus Christe, and to him to whome it is reuealed: S. Augustine likewise in his Booke de spiritu & littera, Cap. 1. and 5. writes in this sorte to Marcellinus, it seemes to thee an absurde thing, when I tell thee that a man may be without sinne, albeit there is none suche founde except Iesus Christe thoughte it to seeme absurde to thee, that a thyng may be done, whereof no Example can be shewed, seeing (as I beleeue) thou doubtest not at all that it was neuer done that a Camell entred the eye of a needle, and yet it is said that suche a thing is possible to God.

By their Aunswere to the nine and twentie Article, it may easily be knowne, that they beguile and abuse their Disciples, making them beleeue by faire wordes and writings, that Really in the Supper they receiue the bodie of Iesus Christe, euen he that issued out of the wombe of the virgine, and was putte vppon the Crosse for the restauration of mankinde.

And they seeke to make to vnderstande, that these which put not to the Sacrament (which they call of the Supper) wyth the Breade and Waine but some Spirituall effecte onely, (as redemption, iustice, sanctification, eternall life, and other giftes and benefites which Iesus Christe brings to hys chosen) diminish the excellencie & dignitie of the same Sacrament, and that they be *Zuinglians*, yea and that ouer

and aboue suche spirituall effectes, it muste be beléeued that the body of Jesus Christe is truely receiued in the Supper, and yet they kéepe an other opinion in their braine.

For when they are prested to Argue, not being able to sustaine that fantasticall presence confessed in their writings, they make themselues Zuinglians, and returne to the spirituall presence of Jesus Christe in the Supper, the same being as muche to say, that diuides the Breade and Wine, they receiue some spirituall effecte, and not Really the body, as the Ministers holde in the presente Aunswere, which as they make manifest by that they recite of the Apostle S. Paule: so by the same may be gathered what is their opinion touching the supper, which is, that the body of our Lord Jesus Christ is not Really, but onely by spirituall effecte in the heartes of the Faithfull. For the Galathians by the hearing of the preaching of S. Paule, did not receiue Really the body of Jesus Christe crucified, but onely had an imagination of the Crosse and Passion of Jesus Christe, and receiued onely the fruite of their Faithe: That is, by that meanes they were iustified and sanctified before God.

The Allegation also which the Ministers make of S. Cyprian, tendes to this ende, to shewe that in the Supper is receiued onely certaine effectes spirituall, which notwithstanding Allegorically are signified by these wordes to embrace the Crosse of Jesus Christe, to sucke his bloude, &c. wherein they denie (albeit against the intente of S. Cyprian in his Sermon of the Supper) the Reall presence of the body of Jesus Christe.

The Doctoures confesse that the Argumente which they haue made, tendes to the Caluinistes, and not to the Zuinglians, neither do they thinke that the ministers woulde otherwayes iudge of this Sacrament, than Caluine, Beza and the other ministers, who vaunte themselues to be ministers of the churche of the Caluinistes, which they call reformed. But those which exhibited to ỹ Bishops being at Poiss the Cõfession touching this Sacrament, vsed an other maner of speech. They without difficultie confessed Really the Bodye of

Jesus

Iesus Christ to be present in the Supper, which at this daie the Ministers denie with the Doctoures conferentes. And as farre as the Doctoures can iudge, the Ministers be come of Caluinistes, Allemanistes: which suche wil not wel disgest, as mainteine the Doctrine of the Churche, whiche they call Reformed, seeing their principal suppostes faile them at néed, as vnable to aunswere one Argumente obiected by the Doctours, as affirming in their aunswere to be so farre illumined with the Holy Spirite, which makes them vnderstande and knowe al things.

Touching the Article folowing, they reueale openly their present opinion touching the presence of Christes Body in the Sacramente, bicause they saie, that the faithful receiue no more in the time of the Gospel, than the Ancientes before the Lawe, and vnder the Lawe. And it is certaine the Ancients receiued not Really the body of Iesus Christ, which was not then formed, so that we muste conclude that vnder the Gospell is not receiued Really the Body of Iesus Christe in the Sacrament, which the Ministers cal the Sacrament of the Supper.

To the 31. Article, they aunswere not as in déede they coulde neuer answere. And necessarily they must confesse, that in vertue of theire Faithe they do that whiche implies contradiction: for they mainteine a thing in one instant & one place to be present, and not present: neither doth their spirituall, or rather fantasticall presence any thing, seeing (according to their Doctrine) the body cannot be present, but with his dimensions, Locally, Diffinitiuely, and Corporally, otherwayes it were to take cleane away, or corrupte the body. And the manner to be there spiritually, cannot make that the body be not there: otherwayes they sayefalsely, that it is present in the Supper, and abuse the worlde: wherefore it is necessary, that if the body be there (yea spiritually) if their Doctrine be true of the nature of a body, that the body of Iesus Christe be Corporally, Diffinitiuely, and Locally in the Supper. Besides, seeing he is absent, according to their confession, it folowes, that he is not there pre-

sent. And as to conclude, the Ministers saie, he is there, and that he is not there: so for an absolute solution, without entring into the principall of the argument, they thinke to escape, with obiecting to vs certaine wordes of briefe, which we haue not yet seene: which we thinke they haue found in certaine Breuiaries of Monkes, as that thei remember whē they were in the Couent they vsed so to chaunt and say. But albeit such things were found in the Breuiaries vsed in the Romish Church, yet such manner of speach might be defended in the sense which the Auncients haue giuen, when they said the Apostles *Conficiunt Corpus Christi*: Like as also the scripture saith, that they baptize, they forgiue sinnes, & saue thos whom thei conuert, which is vnderstand, as Ministers of God, who of his authority, and as Maister, baptiseth, forgiueth sinnes, and iustifieth the faithful persons.

Where the Ministers maruel that the Doctors cal faith, humaine vertue, considering the great & wonderfull effects it worketh: the Doctours replie, that they haue no great occasion of wonder, seing that all worke, so long as it is in man, & that it workes there with God, is reputed humaine: as also ẏ scripture cals the Faith of man, the worke of man. The Doctours delare to the Ministers, that according to their custome, resting alwayes vpon smal things, they follow not that which is the principal in the mater, not vnderstanding (or fayning not to vnderstand) where lies the difficultie of that which is handled: as they do in their aunswer vppon the Argument proponed by the Doctours, by which they obiect that the Ministers by their faith (whether it may be called Diuine or Humaine) may do more than God can: to whiche Obiection the Ministers, without entring to the pointe, aunswere with songs.

In the 32 Article thei passe ouer very lightly many obiections made by ẏ doctors: wherin whether ther be superfluity or repetition, or whether they be impertinēt, ẏ iudgment remaines to the Reader: notwithstāding al ẏ, the doctors wil not forbeare once againe, to require thē to bring forth some place of scripture to ground that God cannot bring to passe

that

that one body be in two places, seeing this cõsequence is so foolish & vaine, God cannot lye: he cannot then bring to passe, that a body be in two places, for so must thei subsume. Wel, God hath said & ordeined that one body cannot be in two places, then he cannot make ỳ it be so: but they shall neuer teach the truth of the assumption, or *Minor* propositiõ, the contrary wherof hath bene verified sufficiently by many testimonies of the Scripture. We demaund also that the Ministers produce some Ancient, yea a man euer reputed Catholike, that durst pronoũce that God could not bring to passe, that one body be in two places. But in all their answeres they coulde not bring forthe any of that opinion, excepte S. Augustine, albeit falsely allcaged bothe in respecte of the Letter, and for the sense of the Letter: neither will wée cease to vrge aswell the Ministers, as al others, that there is founde neither place of Scripture, nor Booke of any Auncient, that God cannot bring to passe, that one body be in two places.

Touching the laste Article, wée ars fully determined to shewe by the pure and expresse Worde of God, interpreted by the common consent of all Antiquitie, that our Lord hath instituted the Sacramente and Sacrifice of the Aultare. And wée wil teache the effecte and vertue of the Masse, according to the Institution and Ordinaunce of Jesus Christe, making also to vnderstande that the Ministers haue polluted and defiled the Sacramentes instituted by Jesus Christe.

And lastely that the Supper mainteined by the Ministers, is no Sacramente in any sorte, but a prophanation of Holy things, conteining execrable Blasphemies, which al the worlde ought to abhorre.

Sondaye the xxij. of Iuly,
*the yeere aforesaide.*

# The Aunswere of the Ministers

to the writing of the Doctours sente to them *by the Duke de Neuers xxy. of July aboute fine of the clocke in the Euening. 1566.*

THe Ministers, afore they enter into particulare Answere to the Obiections and Reproches of the Doctours, seeing in all their speaches withoute any occasion, they laie vppon them imputation of blasphemie, thinke good, in their beginning, to tel them that albeit thei haue heaped iniuries vpon them, yet they holde themselues neuer the more wronged, and muche lesse to be guiltie in blasphemie, bicause they repute them for such, no more than our Lorde Iesus Christe in the iudgemente and opinion of Caiphas the soueraigne Sacrificator, and S. Stephen, vppon whom the saide crime was vrged by the enimies of truthe, and also Naboth notwithstanding he was innocent: for it is a custome common to suche as hate the truthe and the light, to blaspheme that which they vnderstande not, and so yelde to their proper and naturall furie (as S. Peter & Iude write) that impudently they denie things moste apparante, & without shame confesse others that are straunge and obscure: the same being offered of the Doctoures to the Ministers, of whom they will heare nothing with iudgemente, nor iudge their Doctrine vprightly, but seeme in all the course of this Disputation, either to confront them generally without respecte, or at least to giue sentence without examination, that what so euer they produce, is either lyes, or matter of blasphemie.

Act. 7. King. 1. 17.

And albeit the Ministers handling the Omnipotencie of God according as they haue learned by the consent and contentes of the Scriptures, agree alwayes that he is God Almightie,

mighty, as being able (without exception) to do what so euer he will, and that there is no power neither in Heauen nor Earthe, which may hinder, change, or delay in any sort the effect and perfecte execution of his eternal and immoueable counselles: yet his Omnipotencie ought not to be stretched without discretion or distinction to all things generally, that men maye conceiue and imagine in their fonde fansies, but to those onely whiche neither are nor can be, contrary to his iustice, bountie, & wisedome, nor by consequence againste his holy and eternall will, wisedome and truthe, which is and shalbe for euer to do al things wel and wisely with number, weight, and measure without any iniquitie, disorder, or contradiction in any thing he dothe. All whiche things being well vnderstande and considered, are able to cleare the Ministers to all indifferent people of the slaunderous imposition of the Doctours, raised and falsly pronounced by them, to make vs hateful to the worlde. And to proue it by degrees, and set a truth of their slaunders, they chaunge and alter almoste al the speaches of the Ministers, either by additions or retractions, as knowing, that without that policie, they were without meane both to grounde their faide reproches, and giue them any colour of likelyhode: whiche shal neuer appeare by the deduction and particulare confutation of their pretended blasphemies against vs.

Firste they accuse vs as to haue saide, that Gods Omnipotencie ought not to be measured, but by the onely things which are conformable to his will, and not to derogate his wisedome, his truthe, his nature, or the order which he hath established in the worlde. Wherein to verifie their accusation and slaunder, they choppe and hacke this sentence, taking the laste parte of it onely, whiche they haue separated from the reste, and which the Ministers haue made to the whole for a more expresse and cleare declaration howe Gods Almightinesse ought to be honored, beleued, and worshipped of al the worlde: neither haue they vnderstande the terme of order, according to the sense and meaning of the Ministers, who signifie thereby the estate and disposition whiche God

hath established, conserues, and enterteines in all things by his eternall prouidence and immoueable will, onely to intercept that no confusion happen in his workes, according to ỹ Diffinition of S. Augustine in his Bookes de Ordine, and himselfe hathe vsed in the fifth Booke of his Confessions: the which being not vnderstande by the Doctours, they haue translated the opinion of the Ministers to the ordinary and accustomed course of Nature, and to the mouing of the creatures whiche be in this worlde. Wherein, to procure a more exception to the Doctrine aforesaide, they obiecte the myracles that God did aboue nature, inferring thereby that God dothe and maye do againste his Order established.

To the whiche the Ministers aunswere, that albeit the myracles be done ouer and aboue the ordinary course of nature, yet they are not done contrary to the Order aforesaid, bicause al things referred to the prouidence and ordinaunce of God, be well done and rightely disposed, notwithstanding theire reason and Order be many times vnknowne to men, according to the opinion of Salomon, God dothe all things in their time: to the whiche maye be appropriate a testimonie out of the Sentences of S. Augustine, 283. and 284. God, who is the Creatour and Conseruer of Natures, dothe nothing in his myracles contrary to nature.

Neither dothe it followe, that that whiche is newe in custome, is contrary to reason &c. whereof if the Doctours will knowe further, lette them reade the seconde Booke made by the saide Holy Personage of the Order, and likewise what he writes of the myracles in the fifth and sixth Chapter of the thirde Booke of the Trinitie. This aunswere may suffise to confute the two other pretended blasphemies which followe in the obiection of the Doctours.

And touching the fourth we aunswere, that the will of God maye be considered in two sortes, as the Diuines teache: which is, as it is declared to men by wordes, signes, and effectes, and according as it is retained and bidde in himselfe: the one is called, Will knowne by signes, and the other

the Will of the good pleasure of God. For the regarde of the firste consideration, the Ministers confesse, (as heretofore they haue said to the doctors) that God can do many things which he wil not. But to the other we saie, his wil is equal with his power as also his power (in that regard) is equal to his wil: According to which consideration ought to be vnderstanded and interpreted the sentence of Tertullian, alleaged by vs, and euill applied by the Doctours to the Monarchians, as besse may iudge all suche as heedefully reade that place produced by vs, who to annswere an other reproche of the saide Doctoures, accusing vs of wrong to the Auncientes, as to accepte some matter of the Omnipotencie of God, are here enforced to reiterate Theodorete in his thirde Dialogue, who writes as followeth: Wee muste not saie, without some determination, that all things are possible to God: for who so holdes suche absolute opinion, comprehendes all things aswell good as euill, whiche oughte not in any sorte be attributed to God.

By whiche maye appeare, that neither this good Authour, nor the others before alleaged by vs, wouldo not submitte all things indifferently to Goddes power. But do excepte what so euer is contrary to his will and essence.

To be shorte, to qualifie the difference betweene the Ministers, who holde it impossible one body to be in diuerse places at one instant, and the Doctours which affirme the contrary: there is but one meane, which is, that the Doctours, without entring into so long a circuit, and wasting of speache in alleaging so many superfluous matters, do proue summarily by one onely place of the Scripture, that God will do it.

To knowe whether the Ministers haue well or euill alleaged S. Augustine, as to proue that a body cannot be without place and measures, and also whether they haue well or euill defended, that the Quantity is essential in a body, and not accidental (as the Doctours holde) they laie themselues vppon the vpright iudgement of the Readers of the Acts of this conference.

Touching that which followeth in the writing of the Doctours,

tours, that there is no place aboue the Heauens, wherein Iesus Christ is not comprehended & conteined: that the Bodies and Spirites are thereindifferently without any distinction and distaunce of place.

The Ministers saie, that touching all those pointes, they rather beleue the Scripture & expresse worde of God (which they haue alleaged) than all the suttleties and Sophistries which the Doctours or others are able to bring forthe, of their vaine Philosophy. Besides the same is expressely conteined and taught in one of the Articles of our faithe, in this phrase, From thence shal he come to iudge both the quicke & the deade. By which muste be noted, that there is *Vnde*, which is an Aduerbe, signifying place.

Touching the fourth and fifth Articles to know whether the Ministers haue imposed any vntruth vpon the Doctors, they send the Readers to the actes of the former conference, as also to learne in what sense, and to what ende the Ministers haue alleaged the Ancients, which they may more easily perceiue by the reading and diligent obseruation of theire places and sentences there inferred.

Touching the sixth Article, wherin the Doctours had rather confesse their Canons to be false, than in deferring the authoritie of the same, to auowe the body of Iesus Christ to be true, and being true, that it is necessary that it be in one certaine place: the Ministers answere, that by the obseruation of S. Augustines place (from whence is taken the false Canon) it is easie to iudge that the terme *Oportet* is muche more conuenient there, than this worde *Potest*.

To the eighth Article the Ministers answere, that a substance without quantitie, neither is, or can be any waie a body, in that it is and remaines so. And the reason is, because they are two diuers predicaments, that of the substance & that of the quantitie, vnder the which one selfe thing for one selfe respecte cannot be in any sorte comprehended.

Besides, Christe alleageth no other reason, to declare his body was not a spirite, but that he had members and partes, which because of their measures, might be handled and touched

ched: Wherupon it folowed, that without that, a substance can not be a body. And touching the difference that should rest according to the opinion of the Doctors, betweene our soules and bodies, exempt from quātitie (if the same were possible) we say, that albeit they were substances different bothe in number and *species*, yet they shuld be like touching *genus*, and that bothe the one and other should be contained vnder the kinde of substance not corporeo.

The ministers passe ouer the ninthe Article, as a matter but of repetition of wordes, and sufficiently aunswered alreadie.

Touching the tenth Article, we say in the first place, that the consequence whereof there is Question, can not otherwayes be defended by the Doctoures, than by the rule that saithe, of one absurditie may be inferred all things: we complaine billyes of the time which the Doctoures make vs lose in the reading of so many matters already aunswered, and which seeme so often repeated by them, for none other ends than to fill paper, and persuade the world that they do something. For in the first place, the Euangelist saithe not (as the Doctoures pretend) that Christe entred not by the shutte dores, but only that he came the dores being shutte, so that he speakes not there in any sort of the manner of his entrie, nor how the dores were opened, nor yet of any other parte of the house by the which he entred. And as al the sayings of ỹ doctors cannot be founded neither on the scripture, nor any authoritie of the Auncients by them alleaged, who stand rather against, than with them: So, for conclusion, they haue no other ground of their opinion, than their singulare coniectures and imaginations, wyth sinister interpreting the wrytings of the Auncients, to whose Faith they would constraine and allubiet the Church, to the ende that hauing laid this foundation, they may builde afterwardes thereupon, all their absurdities and errours which they meane to deduce. And where they presupposed, that when Iesus entred the dores shut, when he walked vpon the waters, and came out of his graue, those miracles were done rather in his person,

than

than in other things: Iustine writes the contrary, that without any mutation happening in his body, nor in the body of S. Peter, he brought to passe by his diuine vertue, that the Sea againste his nature, serued him as a way: As also S. Hillarie saith to the same respecte, that by his power he did all things passible, with whom S. Iohn Chrysostome consents, as attributing all that to a power Diuine, and confessing frankely that he was ignorant of the manner and fashion thereof. By meane wherof the Ministers maruell much of the presumption of the Doctors, to offer to determine a thing left undecided by the scripture & the Auncients, and touching the which (according to the wise opinion of S. Hillarie) both the sense and the worde do faile, and the truthe of the facte excedes the capacitie of humaine reason. How then dare the Doctors say so impudently, that Christes body passed thorowe the dores, that there was penetration of Dimensions, and that two bodies were in one place, seing that of all this, there is not one only sillable either in the scripture, or witnessed by the Auncientes, who confesse (as is saide) that their vnderstandings and senses were to weake to comprehend or declare the reason of suche a Misterie.

Touching the birthe of Iesus Christe, the ministers stand vpõ the scripture, whose cleare opinion is, ỹ the virgin was bigge bellied, shee broughte forthe and was deliuered, shee gaue sucke, and that in the deliuery, *aperta est vulua*: And yet dothe none of all this derogate or preiudice the state of hir Virginitie or integritie, the same consisting in thys one pointe, that shee neither knewe, nor was knowne of any man.

Wee say moreouer, that in beleeuing this, we folowe the scripture, and by consequence can not erre, nor be Heretikes, neither likewise any other that assubiecte their sense to Gods worde, as the Auncientes by vs alleaged, haue done in this.

In the Article folowing, proponed by the Doctoures touching the manner of Christes Resurrection, it containes no-

thing

thing but coniectures and reproches, with superfluous and weary repeticions, which we haue already satisfied at the full by our former Aunsweres.

And what so euer solowes after in the writings of the Doctoures, are but wrongs and iniuries in place of reasons and argumentes, the same being the laste shifte of contencious wittes, who being destitute of reason, and not able to yelde to truthe, defende themselues with clamoures and sinister impositions.

The Doctoures had some reason in their interpretation of the worde Aphantos, if there solowed autois, but the Euangelist saithe apantoin, shewing clearely that the interpretation of the said place and vnderstanding of S. Ambrose (in which the ministers do settle) is better than the exposition of the Doctoures.

Touching the opening of the Heauens, we Aunswer that they coulde not faile, vsing the phrase of the Scripture, who saithe clearely, that at the Baptisme of Jesus Christe, the Heauens were deuided, and open when S. Stephen was stoned. And as we take it for an imagination of man, to applie to the aire, the signification of the Heauen: So we thinke it should be to diminishe the maiestie of God, and Jesus Christ raised aboue all the Heauens, to establishe the throne of his Maiestie so lowe as in the aire. Neither is there any resemblaunce or likelihode in the saying of the Doctoures touching the being of two bodyes in one place, and the persuasion of the Ministers of the sighte of S. Stephen, which stretched euen to the Heauens, bicause the one is a miracle of Gods power in nature, and the other a wonder againste nature, and contrary to Gods will.

In the Article solowing, the Doctoures doe falsly impose vppon vs an opinion, that it was a thing impossible to God, that a Camel passe thorow the eie of an needle, seeing in our former Aunsweres, we neuer touched that pointe, but only that part of the sentence, speaking of rich men. But now to Aunswer the Obiection and fully resolue it, we say, ỳ euen as

God

God may saue a riche man, by chaunging him, and purging his heart of all vaine trust and presumption, wherewith being infected, he is incapable to enter into the kingdome of heaven: euen so it is no lesse easie for him to make a Camel passe by the creuise of a needle, hauing circumcised and digged the greatnesse of the same, with other things which might let him to passe.

In the first place, that the Supper which is celebrated in the reformed Churche, is the true institution and ordinance of the true Sonne of God.

note / And after, that the end for the which it was instituted, is, to assure the Faithfull of the true participation which they haue in the flesshe of Jesus Christe crucified for their saluation, and in the bloud shedde for remission of their sinnes, and lastly for the confirmation of the newe aliance which God hath contracted with his people.

Thirdly, we say it is necessary that the breade and wine, remaine in their proper substance, yea after the Consecration, and that other wayes they could not be sacraments of the body and bloud of Jesus Christ.

Finally we say, that ỳ vnfaithfull presenting themselues to the supper, can not (by meane of their infidelitie) receiue other thing than the outward signes of bread and wine, and that to their iudgement and condemnation.

1. On the other side, we propone to the Doctoures touching their Masse, that as it is, & celebrated at this day in the Romishe churche, it is nothing but an inuention and tradition of man.

2. That it is a corruption and prophanation aswell of the holy supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, as of the true and lawfull vse of the same.

3. That it is an abuse of the sacrificature of the Papistes priestes, and that in the newe Testament there is no other sacrificature ordained to procure and obtaine remission of sinnes, nor also to intercelle either by prayers or merites to obtaine the fauor of God, than the onely sacrificature of Jesus Christe.

We

We say moreouer, that the sacrifice of the Romish priests is a blasphemie and Sacrilege, and that there is none other Oblation than that which Jesus Christe hathe once made in the Crosse of his body: by which the ire of God might be appaesed, his iustice satisfied, sinners reconciled to God, sinne pardoned, and the bonde of eternall deathe cancelled and made nothing. 4.

We say, the seperation of the priest in the Masse from the rest of the people, is a defacing to the Communion of the supper, and (by consequence) damnable afore God. 5.

It is an intollerable Idolatrie to worship breade & wine: whether it be in the Masse, or out of the Masse. 6.

There rest yet two pointes in the wrytings of the Doctoures, wherof we admonishe them: the one is, that we neuer found in the scripture, that faith was a humaine worke, but that it is a worke of God, and a gifte which he giues to his chosen: The other is, that we confesse not to be able to produce any Auncient author which hathe saide in plaine termes, that one body cannot be in one instant in diuers places, bicause the contrary seemes so absurde and straunge, and so contrary to reason and faith, which all faithful men ought to haue: that we thought such opinion could neuer find place in the hart of any professing to be a Christian. Iohn.6. Ephe.2.

To ende this Answere, we could with greater delite entreat vppon the questions afore saide, than dispute vppon the opening of the dores, the sepulchre and the heauens: as, (to our greefe) we haue done those dayes passed: and that for two reasons. The one, bicause the decision and resolution of such questions can not be drawne and gethered of the scripture. And the secende, bicause it can not muche serue either to the aduauncement of the honoure and glory of God, or to the releefe and instruction of his Churche.

*Thursday. 25. of Iulie the yeare aforesaide.*

# The Replie of the Doctors to the vvriting of the Ministers, sent vnto them by *the Duke of Neuers, the.25 of Julie 1566. about.8. of the clocke in the Euening.*

WHere the ministers complain of their wrong to be called blasphemers, as making themselues innocent with Iesus Christe, S. Stephen and Naboth, vppon whome suche crime was falsly imposed: the Doctoures say, that in this, they folowe the good Donatistes, who vsede alwayes vpon complaint of the great wrongs and iniuries which they saide they endured of the Catholikes: And yet the Hystories stande as witnesses of their conformitie with Iesus Christe, S. Stephen, and Naboth, and also howe nerely these ministers resemble those holy examples. The Anabaptistes might haue saide no lesse to them of the reformed churche, when they call them Heretikes: And so muche also might haue sayd and did say, Seruet, who for his blasphemies was burned at *Geneua*, estéming himselfe happie to be iudged by Caluine, a blasphemer for his Doctrine, and to endure the sentence and paine of death. Therfore we must not beléeue the Ministers to be other than the blasphemers, though they shake of that name no lesse impudently than any other heretike. But it behoues to examine whether their Doctrine import blasphemie or not: we say, there is no blasphemie more worthy of greater curse, than to denie the almightinesse of God, which is no lesse than to denie simplie that God is not, which deniall containes a Theme. For to take from God, that which is proper to him according to his nature, is as much to say, he is not God: according to S. Basile in an Homelie of his intituled, God is not author of euil: He writes, that it is no lesse blasphemie to say God is Author of euill, than to say that God is not God, bicause that to take from God his bountie, which is naturall to him, is wholely

to

to spoile him of his Diuinitie, wherein the like may be saide of his omnipotencie, which who so denieth or diminisheth, denieth also his Diuinitie.

The question then is to knowe, if the ministers will abolisshe the omnipotencie of God, not in proper termes (for they seeme to confesse it) but in affirming that his almightinesse is measured according to his wil: so that he cannot doe but that he wil, with other suche like propositions contained in their former Answeres: which whether we haue proued or not, to containe blasphemies, we lay vs vpon euery sound iudgement, which hath any way serched the holy scriptures, or the bookes of the Auncient Christians: which as they may also be knowne by the friuolous Aunswers of the ministers to our laste Obiections, so, for oure partes, we maruell not much, if they be deceiued in the nature of the almightinesse, seeing they erre in the grounde, as not knowing wherein it consists, and why God is called almightie: For they say, they haue learned of the Scripture that God is omnipotent, bicause he can doe all that he will, and nothing can resist him: the same being as a signe of the power of God, but (vnder correction,) it is not the matter wherein it consistes, and therefore to knowe it, it must be considered according to his Obiect, that is, according to things possible to doe, so ý there is nothing possible, which God can not do: All thing (without exception) is esteemed possible, where is not founde contradiction to be, and not to be: and that comes not by the fault of the power of God (who can doe al things) but by the repugnãcie of the thing that can not be: which the Ministers in the beginning had perhappes put in some Aunswer, were it not, that bicause vpõ certain interrogatories, they Answered that Gods almightinesse must be measured according to his will, and thinking to saue this error, they are slipped into diuers others, which they can not shift of, without falling into an infinite absurditie, as not to confesse to haue failed: Wherin their offence is more, in ý they goe about to limite & bound ý power of God, & not suffer it to stretch to al things generally, ý the spirite of mã may conceiue & imagine, seeing

(of the contrary) it is not to be douted, that Gods power is great aboue the conceit and imaginations of mannes spirite, yea it is infinite and incomprehensible, as S Paule saith, God can doe more, than we either demaunde or understande. And where the ministers say, that God can doe onely all things which are not contrary to his iustice, his wisdome, his bountie and truth, and therfore he can not doe all things generally: it hath bene already told them, that to be able to do things contrary to the iustice, bountie, wisdome, and truthe of God, was not power but impower. And by that also as (S Augustine saithe) in a place alleaged by vs in our former Obiection, that he can not doe suche things, it is an argument of his almightinesse, and no restraint of the same.

And where the ministers inferre, that bicause God cannot doe such things, by consequence, he cānot do any thing which is contrary to his wisdome and eternall will, which is, and shalbe for euer to doe all things well and wisely, with number, poise, and measure, yea without that there be or shall be any iniquitie and contradiction in all that he dothe: it may here be sene how the ministers disguise that which is in cōtrouersie, concealing the matter of their former writing touching the order established in the worlde, againste the which they said God could do nothing, with other matters of blasphemie, which as we did argue, so they durste not reuiue them in their last answere, as in respects their conscience vrged them, and kindled a knowledge, that as such affirmatiōs could not be sustained: so they could not auoide them, but in denying to haue written them, and so accuse vs of slaūder, as to haue altered & chaunged their matters by additions or retractions: for our purgation wherin we send them to our last obiection, where, as the words are produced in the first Article, so the said blasphemies are drawn out of ỳ proper words of the first article of the ministers. And we refer our selues to ỳ collation of our said last writing, with ỳ of ỳ ministers: only it is, as also most certainely it will be found, ỳ we haue faithfully recited the proper wordes of the ministers, which as they wold not auouw in themselues, so it will be knowne

as

at the laste, that til nowe they haue maintained propositions of blasphemie, & that therin wee haue done them no wrong, as pardoning their persons, and being content to speake our simple aduise of their Doctrine.

The Ministers, to shewe their iuste cause to accuse vs of slaunder, say in the first place, that wee haue cut of their proposition, whiche was suche, that the almightinesse of God ought not to be measured but by the things which onely are conformable to his will, and do not derogate his wisedome, his truthe, his nature, nor the order whiche he hath established in the worlde: and that of this, the laste parte onely is taken by the Doctors, who for their purgation say, that they haue alwaies considered what was put in cõtrouersi, which is, if God can bring to passe, that one body be in two places. And to examine the truth of this Question, afore they committed it to writing, they laid the whole with euery part of the Ministers proposition: and haue thus argued, that God can do al things which are conformable to his wil, the same neing knowne whē there is nothing that derogates either his wisedome, his truthe, his nature, or the order whiche he hath established in the worlde: as the Ministers holde, one bodye to be in two places, derogates not the wisedome of God, seeing for all that, God cannot be but wise, it dothe not derogate his truth, for he hath neuer said, that he coulde not do it, neither yet his nature, for if he shoulde, he shoulde forbeare to be God: th if there be any repugnancy, it should be in this, that it would derogate the order which God hath established in ẏ worlde, the same being the cause that they rest not but vpon the laste Article. And wee thinke sure, the Ministers woulde not say, that to be able to make a body to be in diuerse places, were a thing repugnant either to the wisedome, truthe, or nature of God, sauing in that they iudge it repugnes the order which God hath established in ẏ worlde. Besides, the Ministers hauing laid the said proposition as a Rule to knowe what God can do, when they woulde accomodate this Rule to the matter in contention, they oughte afterwardes to say so, to what things repugne that whiche

the Doctours preferre that one Body in one instant maye be in diuerse places: but they saye and write onely what thing, that is to saie, Order &c. whiche Relatiue cannot accorde but with his former Antecedent, by which may clearly appeare, that the Ministers incurre the crime of slaunder, which falsely they obiecte to vs.

And where they say, wee take not the terme of the Order established in the worlde, in the sense they meane it, wee aunswere, that wee haue construed the terme according to the vnderstanding whiche the Ministers haue giuen of it, according to our iudgemente of their speaches, and phrases thereof.

For when was question to bring in any myracle done by Iesus Christe contrary or aboue the nature of things created, the Ministers had alwayes their recourse to the common order of nature, as when speache was vttered of the doores shutte, the comming forth of the Graue, the Virgyns wombe, and of one Body to be in diuerse places, the Ministers vsed no other reason to withstande it, than that al this was contrary to the Order established in the worlde touching the nature of the Bodye, whiche as it cannot be vnderstande but of the common order wee see in nature, so the Doctoures haue therefore brought in againste them, that God cannot doe a myracle contrary to the order established in the worlde, taking it as the Ministers haue declared in their former answeres, against the order of nature, as knowing (for our partes) that the Ancients obserued not this difference aboue nature, or contrary to nature: which appeareth by Tertullian heretofore allcaged, where is saide, that God can bring to passe contrary to nature, that a man flee aswell as a byrde. But wee will not stay vppon rigour of wordes, but apply to the Ministers with whom wee conferre: who cal a worke against the order established in the worlde, a body to be in diuers places, bicause it impugnes the common disposition and property of bodyes: by which reason the Doctours holde, that al other myracles ought also to be accompted contrary to the order established in the worlde, bicause

they

they are against the common disposition and property of nature.

And folowing stil the vnderstanding which the Ministers now giue of the order established in the world, for the estate and disposition which God hath appointed, conserues & enterteines al things by his eternal prouidence and immoueable wil: to guide al things directly, and prouide that no confusion happen in his workes. Here the Ministers committe eftsoones a new blasphemy against Gods Omnipotency: for he may wholy chaunge, alter, & destroy such order as he hath established in the world (albeit he wil neuer do it) and raise a new world more perfecte than this. And if it were so that he could do nothing contrary to this order, his power were terminable and limited: for he coulde not do but certaine effectes according to the order which he had established in the worlde, which should happen not by the repugnancy of the Creatures, but bicause God shoulde binde euen his owne handes: And so (contrary to the Scripture) his hande should be shortened, and his power restrained and lymited: from which blasphemy flowe infinite others, as shalbe well declared by vs, vpon occasion and due opportunitie.

Touching the seconde and thirde Blasphemies noted by the Doctours, the Ministers say, they haue satisfied in one worde by a newe interpretation of the order of the world, whiche fals oute nothing to pourpose, to dissolue the Argumentes produced by the Doctours.

And the Ministers passe ouer the places of Scripture alleaged, which open the Blasphemy, and dissemble the contradiction of the Doctrine, with Caluines opnion touching Gods prouidence in the order established in the world: like as also they spare to answere our obiection that from ỹ third Blasphemy many others do flowe, fearing least in confessing them they heape not blasphemy vpon blasphemy, & by that meane make their Doctrine hateful al the world.

To answere the fourth Blasphemy, the Ministers vse a distinction of the Will of God, whiche may be considered in two sortes, the first is called, Wil knowne by signes, and

the

the other a will of his good pleasure. According to the firste they confesse, that God can do more than he wil, and not according to the seconde, which is (as they say) equall with the power of God, and hid and vnknowne to men: which distinction, if it ought to haue place, we say, that the fundation vpon which they fixe the truth pretended of this proposition, God cannot bring to passe, that one body be in diuerse places, is wholy reuersed: For they will haue Goddes power measured according to his wil: not according to the seconde, which is hid from men, so that it must nedes be according to the firste, by which they confesse, that God can do more than he wil. By whiche it foloweth, that their Rule which they haue giuen to measure the power of God, is false: for it cannot be measured by his wil, seeing he can do more than he will.

The Doctours saye further, that the Ministers ought not require them to proue, that God would that one body were in two places, to shewe that he could do it: for the Doctours would obiecte to them, that, to teache that God can do any thing, we muste not proue that afore he woulde do it: seeing that (according to their confession) God can do more than he wil.

We say further, that seeing the wil of God appeares not to vs but by signes, words, & effectes, and that the order established of God in the worlde, according to his prouidence, (which the Ministers agree withall) is hid to men, that the Ministers cannot affirme, and shewe that God hath established such an order in the worlde, that one body cannot be in diuers places: for it behoued them to teache and instructe of such ordinaunce of God, and declaration of his will. Many times they haue bene required to preferre onely one place of Scripture, where such wil of God is manifest, or where it is saide, that he cannot bring to passe, that one body be in diuerse places.

Touching the place of Tertullian, we leaue to euery direcle iudgemente the vnderstanding of the same. And as for Theodorete, we finde him euil alleaged by the Ministers, as

working more against them, than he aides them. For wher he writes that we muste not say indeterminately, that God can do al things, comprehending therein both good and euil: in this he makes no restraint of Goddes Almightinesse, but (of the contrary) he amplyfieth it, bicause that not to be able to do euil things, is a vertue & power, as hath bene heretofore amply recited.

Where the Ministers require vs to shewe that God would that one Body be in diuerse places, wee answere, that they are two different questions, if God can do it, and if he would do it.

And seing it maye be confessed of all Christians (as in deede it ought to be) that the power is in God, it may be easie to proue the Will by the worde of the Supper, and the Ascension which they of the Religion pretended reformed, haue in custome to depraue and wreste by the impossibilitie which they faine to be in God, to put one body in two places.

The Doctors leaue also to the iudgement of the Readers, whether the ministers haue alleaged S. Augustine to purpose or not, like as concerning the quantitie, whether it is essentiall to be a body or not, wee neuer called it in doubte, that it was not essentiall, speaking of a body as the Philosophers do, *In predicamento quantitatis*

is to knowe if it br
certaine place
it is not
by, w
do

as that which they alleage to confirme that our Lorde is in a place aboue the Heauens, is too friuolous, seeing that by the same reason they might conclude, that the Diuinitie shoulde be circumscripte. And there be Aduerbes signifying place, when in the scripture it is spoken of the Diuinitie, aswel as when there is speach of the Humanitie of Iesus Christ.

Where the Ministers say, wee confesse our Canons to be false, it is a manifeste slaunder: For wee acknowledge no Canons, if they derive not from the Councelles, and other Authentike Bookes, and not as they are gathered by any particulare man, as is the Compilation of Gratian, to whom there is no further faith giuen, than he deserues that is recited by him. For Resolution of the eighth Article, wee sende the Ministers to the Philosophers Schole to learne that there is in the Predicament of substaunce a Body whiche is *Species* of Substance, and in the predicament of Quantitie an other body, which is *Species* of quantitie: and also to learne that the body which is of quantitie, is Accidental (and not essentiall) to the body of the predicament of substance.

Besides the Ministers erre againste all Philosophie, to call a Substance materiall, incorpored. But the Doctours wil not stande vpon those things, and are sory they haue not to doo with men better principled in Philosophy, who would [illegible] than the Ministers doo.

[illegible] equence of two Bo-
[illegible] be in two pla-
[illegible] like in-
[illegible] if the
[illegible] the

passion) they woulde examine the testimonies of the Auncientes, and reasons drawne from the same. But by this we proue, that when there is any thing that pressth the Ministers, it is then they sette a good countenaunce, and make shewe to haue good righte. Besides, the Doctoures marueil muche howe the Ministers dare affirme that Iustine, and all the Auncientes haue not put the myracle of the doores in the body of Iesus Christ, seeing Iustine makes this expresse question, howe it is possible, that a body grosse be not let to passe throughe the doores shutte: in the answere of which question, they conclude it, that bicause that myracle was done in the nature of the Bodye of Iesus Christe, the Apostles iudged it was not a true Body, but a Spirite. As if the Body had bene transnatured into a spirite, which Iustine saith, did not happen, but that without any chaunge of nature, suche operation to passe throughe the doores shutte, was giuen to the Bodye of Iesus Christs by the Omnipotencie of God: as also Iustine saithe, not that anye myracle was done in the Sea, when Iesus walked thereuppon, but that by the Almightinesse that was in him, he made it portable, without chaunge of the nature of his Bodye, or of the Sea, notwithstanding the myracle was in his Bodye, whiche contrary to his nature did so walke.

It is not inoughe to alleage S. Hylarie, that the power of God made place to the Bodye of our Lorde, for he dothe not onely auouche that, but addes the manner of the facte: whiche is, that the Bodye passed without chaunge, or diminishing his nature, or without any opening.

And yet notwithstanding he passed by the operation of the Omnipotencie whiche wroughte in his Bodye piercing the close and shutte places, *Nihil (inquit) cessit ex solido Parietum*, with other like speache whiche he vseth, by which cannot be vnderstand any other thing, than a penetration of many Bodyes.

S. Chrysostome disputes expressely, that contrary to his nature, he passed through the doores shutte, as well as out of the belly of the Virgyn without breaking; neither dothe he

saie simply, that he is ignorante wherein consisted the facte (seeing he discribes it) but he amplifieth the vertue of ỹ facte, and saith, that the reason and greatnesse cannot be comprehended, bicause it proceeded of the power of God incomprehensible.

Touching al which pointes, the Doctours referre themselues to the reading of the Bookes, without any further debate against the Ministers, who thinke alwayes to abuse the ignorance of suche as beleue them, to denie or affirme what they thinke good. And as we greeue and are weary to reiterate the reasons herebefore so familiarely and clearely deduced, so by the euasions of the Ministers so often repeted, we are enforced eftsones to intrude that, which by common consent of the Ancients, they ought to beleue, touching the Articles.

We much maruel of the manner of Answeres of the ministers, who without regard to the matter obiected to them, say what they thinke good of the pointes proponed, and not answere to the Argumentes: as in the Article that toucheth the byrth of Iesus Christe: in the deduction whereof, we haue brought forth many testimonies of the Auncients, holding that our Lord came myraculously from the belly of his mother, as he was also conceiued. Wherin as the said Auncientes affirme, that that Natiuitie was done without any breaking to the body of the Virgyn, so they condemned in Heresie al such as helde the contrary: whiche the Ministers seeke yet to mainteine, and for al their answere affirme it saying (as they say) vppon the Scripture, and dare not openly say, that they reiect the iudgementes of the Auncients and Primitiue Churche, to repose vpon their owne sense, which notwithstanding appeares clearely inough in their Answere vpon this Article, wherein they falsely apply the Scripture, as thoughe it conteined that in the Byrth of our Lorde, *Aperta fuerit vulua Virgins.*

And where they say, that that disclosing impugnes not her Corporal Virginitie (by which the question is mente) they bely the Resolution of the Auncientes, who haue determined

ned vppon this matter.

In the Article of the resurrection, whether there be other matters than coniectures, the reading of the Obiection of the Doctors shall witnesse, the same being to be seene of suche as desire to know the truthe. And where, vppon the ende of the Article of the Resurrection, the ministers complaine that we lay wrongs and scoffes vppon them, we doubte not but they take in displeasure, that their suttleties and maners of doing are discouered: which, if they were well knowne, the world woulde not be so simplie beguiled, as heretofore they haue bene.

The Resolution pretended by the ministers, as being not written aphantos autois, but apauton, is not pertinent. For be it in what sort so euer, our Lord was inuisible to his Disciples, whether it was by sodaine vanishing away or otherwayes, the which vanishing in a body present at the eie not troubled, can not be done but that the body is made inuisible to them. And how so euer it be, the Greeke text beares inuisible and vnseene.

Touching the Article for the opening of the heauens, the ministers (according to their custome) aunswer not directly. For it is not saide that the Heauens were deuided or open, when he mounted thither, as in the baptisme of Iesus Christ and the vision of S. Stephen: but the scripture saith expressely, that Christe pierced the heauens, and not that the heauens disclosed to him: Neither can the ministers forbeare to reproche vs, in deprauing the vnderstanding of our writings, the same being witnessed in this present Aunswere, wherin they faine to vnderstand that in that text of the scripture importing that Christ pierced the heauens, we would signifie the aire vnder the name of the heauens, which neuer entred into our thought: only we said, that the scripture many times speaking of the opening of the Heauens, by the Heauens, meanes the aire: which ought not to be applied to the opinion that our Lorde pierced the heauens. By this manner of Aunswere, the ministers thinke to make forgotten the force of the reasons of the Doctoures, whose speeche was thus: if

when it is spoken in the Scripture, that the Heauens were open, we must wrest the wordes with rigor, and vnderstād that truely the Heauens did deuide: we muste in like sorte, when the Scripture saithe that Jesus pierced the Heauens, take this worde pierced in his proper signification, and with rigoure, which impugnes directly the diuision or opening, as things contrary one to an other: To which reason it giues none other Aunswere, than ordinarily to the other arguments of the saide Doctors.

Touching the difference which they put betwéne ỳ sight of S. Stephen, which stretched euen to the high heauē, and the being of two bodies in one place, and that the one is a miracle of nature, and the other a wonder against nature and the will of God: They should doe muche (as being good secretaries of the councell and will of God) if they coulde teache the Doctoures, that God would the one, and coulde not will the other, and so there woulde be reason in their saying, as to shewe what difference they assigne betwéne bothe.

The inconstancie of the Ministers is knowne in the Article of the Camell, which is, whether God can make him passe through the eie of a néedle: For in their first Aunswer vpon our Obiection, they saide without any distinction, that it was a thing impossible to God to bring to passe, that a Camel (or cable) entred the hole of a Néedle.

And in their seconde Aunswere, they alleage, that Christ, saying what was impossible to men, is possible to God, pretendes no other thing than to Aunswer to the Question proponed by his Disciples, who may be saued: whereunto he answered that that was impossible to men: And that also that sentence of Jesus Christe ought not to be vnderstanded but of the saluation and conuersion of the riche men onely: The which speeche exclusiue (when the ministers affirme that our Lord, saying: what is impossible to men, is possible to God, ought not to be vnderstand but of the saluation of rich men) shewes clearely inoughe that the Ministers ment to say by their Aunswer, that our Lord did not meane to comprehend vnder this proposition what is impossible to men, is possible

ble

ble to God) the possibilitie that a Camell may passe thorowe the eie of a nædle: as if this proposition were not to vnderstand vniuersally, of which our Lorde inferres this particulare, it is possible to God to saue a rich man: yea, he speakes vniuersally by expresse wordes, *omnia apud Deum possibilia sunt*: we desire such as shall read this present wryting to consider the escapes of the Ministers, whose good custome is to disauowe and denie the errors which they maintaine, when by the truthe they are conuinced.

Nowe the ministers, giuing ouer the defence that God can not bring to passe that a Camell passe thorowe the eie of a Nædle, haue inuented a moste friuolous interpretation, in confessing that God can do it, but the meane shuld be, in that God might cut of, and diminishe the greatnesse of a Camell, and all other things that might let him to passe: But the text can not brooke suche a glose, seeing oure Lorde speakes of a thing altogither impossible to men: which shoulde not be: For albeit it were impossible for a man to make and produce a Camell of so little thickenesse and greatnesse, as he might passe thorowe the eie of a Nædle, yet if God produced such one, or if he did proportion or fashion so farre the greatnesse and thicknesse of a Camell, and that a man helde him, he might make him passe.

But there is no Question to produce a Camel, or to make him great or little, but only to make him passe, which shoulde be no miracle in respecte of the passage, if he were so little, but onely in regarde of the production of suche a Beaste, or chaunge of his quantitie. And in taking this name of Camelus for a Cable (which Caluine findes the better) the absurditie of this newe exposition wil appeare the better: For a man may so much extenuate a cable, by drawing out his matter wherof he is made, that in the end he might make it passe thorow the creuise of a Nædle. Besides, it might be easie for a man to make a Nædle, whose hole might be so large, that a cable (yea a Camell) might passe therein: But the scripture speakes of things impossible to a man, and according as they be in their nature: Therefore as we muste take the hole

of a nædle in his little and straite quantitie, so must we take a Camell (or cable) in his naturall greatnesse, neither were the Auncientes euer so suttle, as to inuent suche politike interpretations, which can not be red without laughing.

But they can not so cunningly escape with this fine exposition, that the worlde seeth not clearely inough how they denie that Gods power can stretche so farre, as to make, that a Camell remaining in his crokednesse and thicknesse may passe thorowe the hole of a nædle, but only, when, by the power of God he is brought in quantitie proportionable to the hole of the nædle: the same being against the expresse text of the scripture, and farre from the exposition of the Auncient interpreters. Notwithstanding that, bisides the literal sense, they confer the Camell sometimes Allegorically, which Allegoricall exposition takes not away the truthe of the literall sense, no more than the Actes of Jesus Christ forbeare to be true, albeit the interpreters expounde them Allegorically, wherein the ministers are abused, as thinking, bicause they haue redde some interpretation other than literall in S. Ierome, that the comparison which oure Lorde vseth in this behalfe, is also a Parable: which is false: For it is a true argument that our Lorde vseth to declare his power to saue a rich man, as being a matter of more difficultie, than to make a Camell passe thorow the eie of a nædle.

To conclude this Article, we tell them once againe, that of the deniall of the scope of Gods omnipotencie, doe folowe many other absurdities, which we cã not otherwayes terme than blasphemies: as, that by Gods almightinesse two bodies can not be in one selfe place: that God can not make a body without circumscription of place: That Christ did not enter, nor could enter by the doores shutte: That he did not, nor coulde rise againe, but that the stone of the Monumente was taken away: that he is not, nor could issue out of the virgines wombe without disclosing the body of his mother: that he did not, nor coulde penetrate the heauens without opening of the same: That he did not, nor could make a body, (yea euen his owne) inuisible: And that he could not

bring

bring to passe that a Camel (or cable) keeping his grosenesse, might passe thorow the hole of a Needle: From these is deriued the deniall of his almightinesse, a blasphemie most execrable, and very atheisme: These be the disordered absurdities which such are enforced to confesse that denye the Reall presence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of the Aultare: which the Doctors pray may be well considered by the Readers of this present cautele.

Where the ministers in the last Article of their Answer, chalenge vs for calling Faith an humaine worke, seing it is of God, that is not to be marueiled in them no more than a number of other truthes which seeme straunge to them: because their Doctrine is grounded vpon the foundation of error, amongst the which, this is not least in degree, that man hath not a free will, and that for a man to thinke well, to will well, and to do well, dothe not worke with God, contrary to many places of the Scripture, which settes a man working with God, bothe for his Faithe and workes, and receiues recompence for the same: which shall be more aptly handled in an other place without varying from the matter. We are very glad the Ministers confesse that the Auncientes neuer saide that a body was in two places which is true, but the reason they giue, why they haue not saide it, is of the forge and inuention of the Ministers: they might tel vs as muche out of the testimonie of scripture, wherin is no more founde than in the writings of the Auncients, wherof we haue sundry times warned the said ministers, who chalenge to ground all their Doctrine vpon Gods worde.

If the ministers at the beginning had confessed the truthe of the omnipoteneie, or that they would haue acknowledged that Christe might bring to passe that his body might be on high, and there below in the Sacrament really and truely, if he would, we had no neede to handle the questions passed: which notwithstanding contain no small consequence, as the ministers esteeme, the same appearing by the writings of the Auncients who haue handled those places with great diligence, and with them, haue aided themselues against the

heretikes: But bicause the ministers will not agree that God may bring to passe that one bodie be in diuers places at one instante. And that if they had begon to shewe his will to be suche, as to ordaine that the body of Jesus Christe might be in heauen and in the sacrament, they might haue sayde (as is the opinion of these of their secte) that God would it not, bicause he could it not: And albeit we had rather treate first of the omnipotencie than of the wil, so, seeing the first hath ben sufficiently handled, we are nowe in minde to proue that Jesus Christe woulde and did ordaine his body to be in diuers places, in the prowfe wherof, we will enter into the first conference after we vnderstande the fansie of the Ministers what they holde in their Churche touching this matter, to the ende we trauaile not in vaine, as iudging that they followe not the opinion of Caluine and Beza, for which cause we say they, muche abused the people, saining to teache according to the Custome and Direction of the Reformed Churche, and yet in their Aunsweres, they declare the contrarie.

Where they holde themselues righte happie to endure suche reproches, as to be estéemed seducers by vs, Let them remember that all sectes may say as much as they, but whether it be righte or wrong, we shall make séene by the examination of their Doctrine.

*The Resolution of the Doctoures touching the Article of Gods omnipotencie, as for the regarde of the foure Questions proponed by them to the Ministers, the same serving to the vnderstanding of the Reall presence of the Bodie and Blood of Iesus Christe in the holy Sacrament.*

ALl men disposed with patience to runne thorowe the scriptures, and beginning from Abraham the Father of the Faithfull, euen vntill the laste wryting of the Apostles:

shall

shall finde that the very roote and fountaine of all infidelitie ordinarily was, in hauing regarde to the propretie of creatures and common order of nature, as to gainesay and enter into doubt and distrust of the worde of God.

In respecte of which reason, Tertullian and other firste Christians saide wel that the Philosophers and suche as depended vppon naturall things, were the Fathers of Heretikes: bicause the contemplation of nature engendred almost al heresies: of the contrary, men may perceiue that the omnipotencie of God is proponed by the scriptures, as a knife cutting in sunder all argumentes which might come of naturall reasons: as to take a certaine and last resolution to beleeue al that is written and imported by the said worde of God, albeit it seeme impossible and incomprehensible to all creatures, and that our Faithe might rest vppon the same power, in all doutes what so euer.

All the difficulties that Abraham made vppon the promises which God made to him, proceeded of certaine impossibilities of nature which he saw in himselfe & in his wife: wherin it seemes that his cõsideration stretched no further, til God vsed his authoritie and said to him, I am God almightie: since warning of God, Abraham forgate all regardes to the proprieties of his nature, and take holde of this buckler of faith, which is to knowe and fully persuade himselfe, that God is almightie, to whome nothing is hard or impossible: And after this, when there was question to slea his onely sonne, notwithstanding he had greate apparance of contradiction in nature, and in the worde of God ginen to him (which was, that from the sede of that sonne should issue one that should blisse all nations, and yet he must kill him afore he had any linage distending of his bodie) yet he did not contest, as opposing this contradiction of nature, and of the worde of God, to maintaine, that which had bene saide and promised him, was impossible: but he had recourse to the pilloure of the Faithe of the Faithfull (as S. Paule to the Hebrues) which is, to the omnipotencie, with this persuasion, that God had the meane to make the one and the other true, as to make his sonne

die, and raise him vp againe, to the ende to drawe out of him afterwarde, linage and posteritie: (albeit as then there had bene no example of the Resurrection.)

Likewise the consideration of creatures, and the order of nature which Moises saw before him, made him fal into infidelitie: but God shewed him his fault, when he denyed that he was able to nourish the people long with flesh: seeing the nature of the deserte did not beare it, warning him to raise vp his spirite to the almightinesse against nature, and there to settle and assure his Faithe.

Moyses saide: Here be sixe hundred thousande people, in the midst of whom I am, and thou hast said, I wil giue them flesh, to the ende they eate a whole month, shal we kil them Muttons or Beeues which may suffise them? Or shal we gather all the Fishes of the sea to content them? God answered to Moyses: the hand of the Lord is it shortned? thou shalt see now whether my words wil come to passe or not.

In like manner, as often as we reade in the Scriptures, that the multitude or other particular sort fel into infidelitie or distrust of the aide and succors of God, we shall finde that ordinarily it moued in respecte they rested vppon the nature and disposition of humaine things, and did not comprehende sufficiently the power of God: and of the contrary, to confirme them, we finde that this power was put before their eies, wherof we haue here before produced certaine Examples of Esay and Ierome.

In the newe Testamente, the Virgine seemed to make some doubte of the meane of hir Conception, as hauing regarde to the naturall manner of conceiuing: For shee sayde, howe may this be, seeing I know no man? But the Aungell Aunswered, nothing is impossible to God, drawing her by that from the imagination of naturall properties, which is the roote of infidelitie, & exhorted hir to aspire to the almightinesse of God, as being the first stone and rocke wherupon is builded true religion.

This being considered, and so to resolue w̄ the Ministers for this conference, we say, ỹ by good right, gods almightines

obtaines

obteines expressely the first place amongest the Articles of the Apostles Créde, as being the same, by the which the other Articles of Faith and doings of God aboue nature, are beleued and mainteined against all contradiction and repugnancie of nature, or reason that may be pretended or alleged, and without the which, neither Article of the Faithe, or any doings of God surpassing nature, and conteined in the Scripture, can be defended against the malice and depravation of humaine Spirite, which tendes alwayes to infidelitie and disobedience to God, and is prompt and suttle, from his byrth, to deprave and reproche the word and commaundement of the same, by meane whereof wée say, that so much the more euery good Christian oughte to enforce himselfe to hold & preserue this Article whole, without either suffering any exception, or to restraine it to our single pleasure or purpose, vnder colour of incertaine pretended repugnances of Creatures moving in the Spirites of men, for want of direct vnderstanding, & comprehending the greatnesse of God: for as the Scripture gives to vs alwayes this Omnipotency in generall, without any restrainte in regarde of creatures and doings of God, so it teacheth vs, that creatures are vnder his obedience, as the Clay in the handes of the Potter to receiue such chaunge and fourme as he thinks best, without that they can say, why do you this to me, or why chaunge you me? such similitude of speach vse the Prophet Esay, Ierome, and S. Paule.

Wée say further, that so much lesse ought it to be licenced to men to limit and bound the said power according to the contradictions which they imagyn in their fansies, of the nature, wisedome, or eternall will of God: seeing the expresse sentence of the Scripture is, that as God can do more than wée vnderstand, so he smiles at such as wil meddle with his nature, wisedome, & eternal wil: as if they were his Counsellers, and knewe further of his iudgements and ordinances, than his owne word doth pronounce: and in the ende, all spirites created are constrained with S. Paule, to cry out, confessing their ignorance of the power & wisedome of God,

 and

and of his doings: Oh depth of Riches of the knowledge & wisedome of God? Oh that his iudgementes are incomprehensible, and his wayes impossible to finde. For who is he, that hath knowne the intent of the Lord? or who hath bene his Counseller? Wherewith wee may also note vpon this pointe a godly sentence of S. Augustine in an Epistle of his to Volusianus: Wee confesse that God can doo something, which in searching wee cannot finde, meaning that as God can doo something, so albeit in our naturall iudgemente wee thinke it impossible, yet let vs hold it possible: only the capacity of our spirite is not able to comprehende it.

Wee say further, that by suche licence and meane to exempt from Goddes power at our pleasure, vnder colour of certaine impossibilities of nature, or repugnancy supposed by our owne iudgement in the nature, wisedome, or will of God, euery one may study to faine the like in all matters of Faith, wherein suche things may be easily inuented or disguised.

And that it be so, if all the Heresies be obserued that haue withstād it in euery time from the first Article of the Creede euen to the laste, it will appeare, that they al haue kept this way and methode, to shake euery Article of the Faith, as impossible to God, considering the impossibility of the facte according to nature, and certaine pretended inconueniences against nature, wisedome, will, and glory of God. To this effecte also wee apply the twoo firste Bookes of Tertullian, whereof the one is of the Incarnation of Jesus Christe, and the other of the Resurrection of his Flesshe, againste the Marcionistes: wherein the Christian Reader shall reade like Argumentes of the saide Marcionistes, labouring to exempt the Incarnation of our Sauiour, and Resurrection of his Flesshe, from the Omnipotency of God.

Nowe to conclude this pointe, wee speake it to all good Christians, that to the ende to adde nothing to the Scriptures, whose speache is alwayes of the power of God to his Creatures, without any lymitation, and to the ende to glorifie the infinite power, wisedome, and eternall will of our

Crea-

Creatour and Redéemer: and also not to open the vessell of the secretes of God to euery impudent, who of his owne folie will sette Lawes to men, but to the power, wisedome, and eternal wil of God.

And lastely to the ende not to bring into the worlde all Heresies onely, but also an Atheisme, who (according to his sense and fansie,) may and will oppose and gainesay the infinite power of the true, liuing, and eternall God.

Wée affirme eftsones that it is necessary to beleue, confesse, and mainteine, that our God is the Almighty Lorde without ende, to whom as nothing is impossible, so euen the least of his workes standing daily afore our eies, cannot be comprehended. And in plaine speache, he is no more a Christian, nor a faithfull man, who restraines or drawes into any lymit the power of God: for thereby he reuerseth the maintenaunce of the Faithe, which ought to be generall, as to the which no exception can be giuen.

But as the Omnipotency ought to be kepte in his generalitie and perfection, so our opinion is, that it is not inough to say, that God is almighty, and hath the vertue to doo any thing, as to inferre that it is done: for all that our Lorde can doo, he hath not yet done, nor neuer wil do, bicause his power is infinite. But the knowledge of this omnipotency serues to confesse & magnifie the greatnesse of our God, & to maintein his workes incredible by nature which are comprehended in his word, & in our Faith: and also to confute all suche as woulde deny any of them as impossible to be done by any manner what so euer.

And bicause Caluin and Beza with their Ministers, raise them selues against the power and greatnesse of our Lorde, and openly deny him to be able to commit the body & blonde of Jesus Christ vnder the formes of Breade and Wine: and bicause also that in the Religion pretended reformed, (to resist the efficacy of the worde, This is my Body, this is my Blonde) they teach not a more great reason, nor more familiare to al those that are out of the way, than the impossibilitie of God, to be able to make a body to be in two or many

places,

places, that is to say, in the Sacrament, and in Heauen: wée obiecte with good righte to the Ministers, that in their Doctrine they derogate the firste Article of Faithe, which is, of the Almightinesse of God. And also we knowe that the ancientes manner of the Christians, disputing againste the aduersaries of Faith, was oftentimes to beginne to aske, whether that whereon they doubted were possible to God or not, or whether onely he woulde not do it: in which sorte and order Tertullian and others propone the pointes wherein they enter into contention againste the Heretikes.

In like sort, afore we passe further into the matter of the holy Sacramẽt, we would (in preamble wise) fele of the Ministers, whether they iudged it to be in Goddes power to make a body occupy many places, or whether only he would not &c. wherein wée are enforced to aduertise al Christians of one manner of dealing common to al the Ministers of the pretended reformed Religion, which is, when they are asked, if God can establish the body of Iesus Christ in the Sacrament or not: they aunswere, that there is no question of the power of God, but of his Will onely. And when wée produce matter which declares the will of God, then (of the contrary) they deny that his wil is suche, bicause it is impossible to him. Alleaging here, their contradictions according to the nature of the body. And bicause they thinke this to be impossible in action, they depraue and interprete the worde of the Supper otherwayes than either it beares, or is written.

Here is also to be noted that, wherin an *Almaine* called Heshusius, reprocheth Caluin, that he & his felowe Ministers are godly & noble amplifiers of the power of God, but when it comes to the déede and pushe (as the saying runnes) they neither giue or graunte him any more, than they thinke méete, to introduce their errours and fansies, resembling (as the saide *Almaine* compares them) a good Traitor, who most doth cherishe and magnifie a man, when he is most ready to betray him, as Iudas did our Lorde: wherin wée are constrained to say of the Ministers touching Goddes Almightinesse,

as

as Tertullian saith of the Heretikes, *Credendo non credunt*, which is, in beleuing the Omnipotencie, they beleue it not: for when they haue saide, that there muste be no exception, they hold againe an other way, that it must not stretch to euery thing that mannes spryte can conceiue, and so they will not apply it but to what they thinke good, couering themselues with the nature, wisedome, & eternal wil of God, which are no lesse vnknowne and incomprehensible to them, than his Omnipotencie: in which respecte wee aduise euery one not to be abused with the speach of Caluin nor his ministers, but to consider the wordes which they deny to be in the power of God. Wee haue produced to them these foure questions: Whether God may make a body to be in two places, and (of the contrary) two bodyes in one place: Whether he can lodge one body in one space, lesse than his greatnesse, and whether he can make it inuisible, which haue bene specially culled and chosen, for that vpon them are founded the principal arguments of the pretended reformed Religion againste the true presence of the Bodye and Bloude of Iesus Christ in the Holy Sacrament.

Wee beleue simply (as al other things) that the foure questions are possible to God, and haue proued it by the infinitie of his power, both by the scriptures, who giue vnto him al vertue ouer creatures without any exception, and also by Examples and straunge myracles don vpon bodyes againste their natures, which are writte, as Tertullian holdeth in his Booke of the Resurrection, to the ende wee beleue that our God is more mighty than al Lawe and nature of al bodyes, whereunto he addes, that such knowe God very euill, who thinke that he hath not in his power, things which thei cannot comprehende in their fantie. From whence it comes (as S. Cyrul saith) that such wicked sprytes reiecte and condemne al things as impossible, bicause they vnderstand them not.

Besides, wee thinke wee haue sufficiently shewed no lesse by expresse scripture, than by the Exposition of the same, taken of the Ancient Christians, that it was not only in Gods power to make two bodyes to be in one place, and one body

without place equall to his greateneſſe, but alſo that he had already truely done it in the byrth of the body of our Lorde Jeſus Chriſte, in the Reſurrection of the ſame, in his entry throughe the dores ſhutte, and in his Aſcenſion aboue al the Heauens: like as alſo wee haue deduced, that there was equall and like repugnancy in thoſe dædes, as in the other of one body in two places, whiche by the ſcripture is no more excepted from the power nor will of God than the others, as to iudge it impoſſible to be done: neither hath there bene any Chriſtian afore our time which durſt affirme the ſame to be impoſſible and out of the power of God, notwithſtanding the occaſion was often offered, if they had any waye eſteemed it impoſſible, as the Miniſters of the ſuppoſed reformed Religion pretende.

Of the contrary, the moſt parte of the auncient Authours of the Primitiue Churche haue holden expreſſely, that it was in Goddes power to beſtowe a creature in many places, according to S. Ieromes opinion againſte the Heretike Vigilantius, that the ſoules of the Sainctes maye aſſiſte in many places, with the immaculate Lambe our Sauiour Jeſus Chriſte. Yea there was queſtion, Whether the ſaide ſoules and ſpirites of the Holy ones, did aſſiſte at any time the Churches, where their Graues and Monumentes were: the ſame reſembling with S. Auguſtine in his Booke whiche he wrote of the care to be had of the Dead, Chapter 16, wher he ſaithe, that by the power of their nature, the ſoules cannot be here belowe, and in Heauen, or in many places, but that the ſame may be done by the power of God, and he will not reſolue, whether they vnderſtande our affayres by ſuche aſſiſtaunce in many places, or by reuelation of the Aungels, or other meane of the power and grace of God.

Moreouer it is moſt certaine, that the Auncient Fathers of the Churche, in the matter of the Holy Sacramente, haue acknowledged & mainteined that the Body of Jeſus Chriſte by Omnipotencie was in many places, as S. Ambroſe vpon the tenth of the Epiſtle to the Hebrewes, and S. Chryſoſtome in his ſeuententh Homilie vpon the ſame Epiſtle,

where

where they both almoste in one phrase and woordes, write, that albeit in many places there be many actions and oblations of the Body of Jesus Christe, yet hauing regard to the thing which is offered, (that is, to the true Lambe and body of Jesus Christe) that Sacrifice offered in many places, is but one, bicause it is but one selfe thing, the true Lambe and true body of Jesus Christe, which is but one, and remaines whole in all places where he is offered.

And they adde further, that the Oblation of the same in diuers places, is not an iteratiō of the sacrifice of the Crosse, but in commendation of the same: so that in the sacrifice of the Masse, they acknowledge and distinguishe twoo pointes, the one, concerning the Realty of the thing that is offered, which they saie is the true Lambe, and true Body of Jesus Christ, who as then remaining one and in his entyer, is notwithstanding in many places. And the other concernes the action of suche a thing by the Prieste, whiche is no iteration, nor like action, or oblation to that of the Crosse, but diuers in commemoratiō notwithstanding of that which was made on the Crosse. S. Chrysostome in his thirde Booke of Priestehoode, cryes out, and saith, Oh myracle and power of God: He that sits on the Right hande of the Father aboue, is holden betwene the handes of euery one in this sacrament. S. Augustine vpon the 33. Psalme declares, that the body of Jesus Christ in the supper, was in two places, that is, in his visible place amongeste his Apostles, and yet betwéene his proper handes, in suche sorte as he carried him selfe. But afore he concluded vpon this, S. Augustine debates with him selfe howe it was possible, that a person shoulde beare his Body betwéene his handes: And after he hath examined it to be impossible to Dauid and al other creatures, he discends at last to the Diuine power which was in Jesus Christe, by the whiche, to him alone amongest other men that myracle was possible.

But leaste wéedepraue or wrest the intent of S. Augustine, bicause he was carried in a certaine maner (as though that diminished the truth) let vs consider that the ende meaning

ning of S. Augustine is, to shewe that Jesus by his Omnipotencie carried him selfe, which was impossible to any Creature. But if he had only carried in the Supper betweene his handes, the Figure, Sacrament, and Signe of his Body, and not the Reall Truthe, he had done no more than the leaste man mighte haue done, seeing euery one maye beare the Figure, Image, Signe, or Sacrament of his body betweene his handes, or fastened as a Brwche to his Cappe, without myracle or power supernaturall: so that the certaine manner which S. Augustine vseth, diminisheth nothing of the Truth: which is, that he was visible betweene his hands, and in one manner supernatural, albeit Real and true.

S. Basil, with others in his Liturgie, auowes the body of Jesus Christ to be in Heauen, and yet present in the Sacrament by Omnipotencie. And yet the Ministers are grounded principally vppon the saide S. Basil, to proue the impossibilitie that one bodye or an other creature maye be in many places. But he protestes expressely in the very place alleaged by the Ministers, not to speake but according to the natural propertie.

And in his Liturgy he declares, that it is not only in Gods power to bring to passe, that the body of Jesus Christe be in Heauen, and in the Aultare, but also that it be truely done so.

To end this question of one body in many places, we say that it is not only in the power of God, but also we must beleue that it is so done in the Sacrament, to the ende God be not founde a lyer or a deceiuer in his worde, by which Jesus affirmed to his Apostles that that whiche he gaue with his handes was his true Body deliuered for vs. Which Argumente Tertullian makes in his Booke of the Resurrection after he had disputed against suche as denied it to be possible to God: wherin it seemes that they saide (as the Ministers said firste) there was something impossible to God by Scripture, whiche is, that he could not lye nor deceiue: of which they toke occasion to passe further, and dispute that the Resurrection was also impossible to him: like as also the Ministers

sters, of the point that could not lie, haue laboʒed to inferre, that to put one body in two places, was impossible to him, as well as to lie and deceiue: in the ende, Tertullian accoʒdes with the Martianistes that he had rather confesse that God could not deceiue, and that he is only weake and impotent in deceit, to the ende that thereby it might be seene, that he hath not otherwayes taughte oʒ spoken, noʒ otherwayes disposed the facte, than is contained in his woʒde. Then, if he can not (as Tertullian concludes) deceiue and abuse, we must beleeue the resurrection, as his woʒd beares it, and not otherwayes, to the ende there be no deceit in the sayd woʒde and in God: Euen so we say, and willingly confesse that God can not lie noʒ deceiue, in regarde wherof we must beleeue, that he hath so willed and oʒdained the truthe of the supper, as the woʒd pʒonounceth, and not otherwayes. And if it be so ẏ the woʒd beare *Verbatim*, and expʒessely, that he affirmes that that which he gaue with his handes to his Apostles to eate, was his body deliuered foʒ vs, we must thē beleeue that his woʒd speakes not otherwayes then his will is, least he be esteemed a lier: And that as he hathe saide, this is my Body, this is my blond, that truely it is so, which (God willing) we meane to handle in the nert conference foʒ declaration that not onely he might establishe his body in the holy Sacrament, but also that he would, and did so.

*Articles proponed by the Doctors, for the next conference and others folowing according to the order of the said Articles.*

Albeit, (accoʒding to the oʒder of the conference) touching the Creede of the Apostles, we ought secondly to entreate of an other Article: (like as euen the ministers themselues in the first dayes of conference did not only consent, but made request, offering the Articles of their Confession Impʒinted vnder Date. 1564. to be examined by vs from the firste to the last) yet we, seeing it can not be much from the matter, after we haue handled the omnipotencie of God, (which stretches

so

so farre as to make him able to bring to passe that the bodie of Jesus Christ be in heauen and in the sacrament) continuing stil this matter, to enter into the prose of his wil are content to shew that not only he could do it, but also he would do it, and so consequently are determined to refute all the blasphemies & heresies of the supposed reformed side, which are contained in the supper, to the ende also we be not thought to eschue the combate of the supper & the Masse, as ỳ ministers haue reproched to vs: protesting notwithstanding to kæpe in meaning, that after we haue concluded & resolued vpon this matter, to returne to the examination of the mõstrous errors of the ministers, which containe great numbers against the other Articles of the Crede: which the ministers feare, by all likelihode, in that they are not willing we pursue the order begon, as foresæing, ỳ in the next conference, we wold open vnto them an other blasphemie maintained by the reformed church against the bountie of God, according to Calumes doctrine, which is, that God works in the reprobate the euill & sinne which they cõmit, which is an execrable atheisme, & no lesse than the denial of gods omnipetẽcie: and in like sort, as such as shal read these cõferences (if they continue to the end & discussing of the ministers errors & their religion against al the articles of the Crede) shall maruel to vnderstand the absurdities & blasphemies discending from them: so yet there is an other point ỳ drawes the ministers to demaund the disputation of the supper, which is, ỳ they haue al their matter redily prepared by many of their sect which haue written therof: as especially they will not want the great Booke of Peter Martir by which they are furnished with sundrie infamous obiections, & certaine texts of the Ancients either cut of & depraued, or euil applied, to impugne (in shew) the truth of the body in the sacrament: but to the defense of all their other errors, they are very slenderly prouided: wherin their cõscience is a sufficient witnesse, ỳ by the scripture, iudgmẽt of general councels, & cõmon consent of ỳ authorities of ỳ ancients, they are cõuinced & condẽned of their errors against ỳ said Crede.

But to enter into the supper of the ministers, we say it is

a prophane eating & drinking, not differing from the cõmon eating & drinking, saving that it is so much the worse, as they abuse the holy institution of the supper of Jesus, and pollute and defile such their banket withal impietie & blasphemie: we maintaine also that they do great wrong to the sacrament of Jesus Christe, to attribute falsly to suche their banket so prophane and defiled, the name of sacrament: And to the ende to proue it more cleare, we aske them, if they receiue a common doctrine, allowed not only in the catholike church, but also of all the sects which are separated frõ it: the same is, that in the confection of sacramentes, there be two things essentiall and necessary, the matter (or the element) and the worde.

Secondly, what word is necessary ẃ the element to cõstitute a sacrament, & namely ẏ which they cal the sacrament of the supper, and whether they must vse certain words or not.

Thirdly, if the worde haue any vertue or efficacie in this sacrament, and what: And if it worke any thing in the matter of bread and wine.

Fourthly, whether by the same word the consecration be made of the matter of the sacrament or not.

In the fifth place, if by the word, there be not made consecration of the matter: that is, howe the same consecration is made, and by what vertue the sacrament is made.

For the firth, if besides the bread & wine, and the spirituall graces & benefites of Jesus Christ, is receiued in ẏ supper really the true body & bloud of Jesus Christe in his proper substance, & not only in spiritnall effect: vpon this Article we require of the ministers, an open confession of faithe.

We aske further, if in receiuing ẏ bread afore they take the wine, they receiue by ẏ eating of ẏ bred, the body & blud of Jesus Christ, or only ẏ body: to be short, if they admit ẏ which ẏ diuines cal a concomitance of ẏ body & bloud of Jesus Christ.

We aske also, if the supper, besides the assurance it giues them of participation in the flesh of Jesus Christ in their redemption, do worke in them remission of sinne.

We aske lastly, if by ẏ supper, there is receiued any thing which can not be receiued oute of the Supper, or, if withoute

taking

taking of breade to goe to the Supper, or to assist it, may be receiued as muche of the body and graces of Iesus Christ, as if they did assist the supper.

We will debate afterwards the other Articles contained in the laste pamphelet of the ministers, bicause the former demaundes are to be first examined as grounds of the other Articles proponed by the ministers.

For the rest, after the supper of the ministers is confuted, and the Real presence of the body and bloud of Iesus Christ in the sacrament, confirmed: we will procæde by order and without confusion, to teache clearely by the pure and moste expresse worde of God, that the Masse was instituted & said by Iesus Christe, and that also he commaunded his Apostles to say it, which they did accoording to the ordinaunce of their Maister.

That the Masse is a true sacrifice of the Euangelical law.

That suche as reiecte the Masse, and admit no outwarde sacrifice in the Church, nor priesthode, are without true law and without true Religion, and therefore worse than Idolatrers.

That the Masse is of value to obtaine remission of sinnes, fauoure and grace of God, and that it is of value bothe for the quicke and the dead.

That it is no abuse in the Church, if the Priest communicate alone in the Masse, when the assistantes will not communicate with him.

That suche commit horrible blasphemie, which call the worshipping of the body of Iesus Christ in the Sacrament, the worshipping of breade and wine, and falsly doe they call such veneration of the body of Iesus Christ, idolatrie.

To be short, there is nothing in the masse as it is celebrated in the Church at this day, which is not good and holy in it selfe, and conformable to the worde of God.

We require the ministers to Aunswere to the demaundes here before written, pertinently, clearly, and by order.

*Sunday. 28. of Iulie, the yeare aforesaide.*

The

# The Aunswere of the Ministers

to the vvryting of the Doctors, sent to them *by the Duke of Nyuernois the. 28. of Iulie. 1566. about. 7. of the clocke in the Euening.*

THe Doctors in the beginning of their writing reproche vs, as that in our complainte against them, we imitate the Donatistes: wherin they nullifie oure former iudgement and opinion of them, that the moste parte of their wrytings swarmed more with matters of repetition, iniuries, scoffes and inuectiues than with argumentes and good reasons: like as also the example of the Donatistes, becomes them farre better than vs: bicause the Donatistes soughte to restraine the name of the Churche, who comprehendes vniuersally all the chosen and Faithfull, that eyther are, or euer were: and attribute it to the onely companie of those that folowed their customes and errours, as at this day the Doctoures allowe not to be of the Catholike and vniuersall Churche, other than suche as folowe the traditions and abuses of the Romishe Churche.

Bisides, as the Donatistes persecuted such as stode against their Doctrine, vsing euery violence and cruelitie they coulde imagine according to S. Augustines testimonie in many places, so the whole worlde standes to iudge of the rage and furie, as well of the Doctoures, as their complices, priests and hipocrite Monkes, against the poore Christians in times past, like as also for the present, there is none that knowes not, bothe by their Sermones, wrytings and conferences, what hatefull and grudging mindes they beare against the seruauntes and children of God, and howe much they would delite to rote them vp, if their power were equall with their desire: By which may be iudged, whether they or we resemble neareste the example of the Donatistes.

And where they say, we are neuertheleste blasphemers,

bicause we shake of and detest the name, we Aunswere that they are also neuertheleſſe reprochers and backebiters, notwithstanding they denie it and disauow the title: Like as the mutuall effectes on bothe partes stande as Arbitratours, to which of vs theſe crimes and names may appertaine or be attributed.

And where the Doctours in the same Article say, that it is a blaſphemie againſt the bountie of God, to charge him with imputacion to be Authoure of vice and sinne, we confeſſe it: with this addition, that it is also a blaſphemie againſte his truthe, to say that in him is yea and no: as they doe, who vnder a coloure and faiſe pretence to eſtabliſhe the omnipotencie of God, affirme, that in one inſtant, he may bring to paſſe that one body be in diuers places, which is to say, that he is, and is not.

Touching that which they say after, that we erre in the groundes of the omnipotencie of God: as saying that he was almightie, for that he dothe what he liſt, and that nothing can hinder or let the execution of his Counceiles: we Aunswere that in that we folowed the Definition of S. Auguſtine in the Enchiridion, cap. 96. whoſe wordes be theſe, *verbatim*: truely he is not called Omnipotente by any other reaſon than that he dothe all that he will, and that the effecte of the will of the almightie, is not hindred by the will or effect of any creature.

Touching an other their matter of imputation againſte vs, in that we ſhould say that the almightineſſe of God, ought not to be ſtretched generally to all things that mennes wits can conceiue and imagine, we Anſwer, and (vnder correction of the Doctours) say, we ſaid not ſo, but that Gods omnipotencie ought not to be ſtretched without ſome diſcretion or diſtinction, to all things generally, that men may forge and imagine in their fooliſhe fanſies, wherein it may eſtſones appeare to euery one, howe they cut of and falſifie our ſpeaches and ſentences, as to haue meane and coloure, to ſlaunder vs.

Againſt that they say after, that it is a blaſphemie to holde that God can doe nothing againſte order, we say, in the contrary, that to thinke and ſpeake that he can doe any thing

which

which is not well ordained, is to blaspheme his wisdome and eternall prouidence.

In the Article folowing, the Doctoures pretende that for one body at one instante to be in diuers places, is not a thing that derogates the truthe of God: we maintaine the contrary, that it would derogate bothe his truthe, bicause there should be in him (as is sayde) yea and no, and also his wisdome, for that in his workes there shoulde be disorder and confusion: and by consequent, it woulde derogate his omnipotencie, seing that in his doings there would be imperfection: And we say further, that it would not only be againste the disposition and ordinary course of nature (as the Doctors faine to thinke and vnderstande) but also againste the eternal and immoueable will of our God.

And where, the Doctoures, to proue that God may doe any thing againste order, affirme that he may chaunge and alter the order he hathe established in the world, we confesse it but denie that in doing so, he shoulde doe any thing that was disordained, as (for Example) all the Faithfull and Christians, beleeue that God, in the ende, will renue the state of all the worlde, and yet in this time, notwithstanding, there shall be nothing which is not well ordained, perfect and accomplished in all his partes.

In the Article folowing, the Doctors confounde the distinction proponed by vs in our Answers, betweene the will of God manifested, & that which he holds hid in himselfe, and is equall to his power, as we haue heretofore amplis declared: wherin the Doctors prepone a falſe touching the wil of God manifested, as taking generally, ỳ which we agreed vnto thē only, in certaine particulare cases, which is, that God can doe more in certaine things, than he hath declared he wil, which no man doubtes: as S. Augustine saith in his booke of perfect iustice, that he nā not wel bring to passe, that a man be perfect in this worlde, and so sanctifie him, that there rest no more infirmitie or imperfection in him, and yet he neuer declared to vs by his worde, that he would doe it.

But of the contrary that the flesh will alwayes resist the

spirite in all those that are regenerate, in suche sorte that all the time of their liues, they shalbe imperfect in many partes: But be it that in this case, and any other like to it, God can noe more than his will beares that is manifest to vs in his worde: yet, it is not to say for all that, but that there be other cases, wherin God hathe reuealed to vs his will, against the which he can not do or order any thing: as (for example) he hathe tolde vs that he is one, that he is inuocable, incomprehensible, altogether good, wholly iust, no way imperfecte, and euery way true: against all which things (which are disclosed to vs, and plainely pronounced in his worde) it is impossible to him euer to thinke, say, do, or order any thing: it is not so then that the matter proponed and debated by the Doctoures touching a body to be in diuers places at one instant is comprehended within this, being (as is said) contrary to the truth of God, which shal serue to answer their slaunders, and to al else which they haue proponed in this Article: as also in an other Article folowing, where they say, ỳ God can not only, but that he wil also bring to passe that one body occupie diuers places in one instant, which shalbe more impossible to them to proue the power aforesaide, by the which they haue made so muche labour hithertofore in vaine.

In the definition which they vse of a body in the Article folowing, they say against themselues, in holding ỳ the dimensions are essentiall to him, and yet notwithstanding he may be uncircumscript: for if it be necessary, that the dimensions wherof he is composed, be terminable, it folowes then necessarily that he is termined, limited, and circumscript.

Afterwardes where they say, that our reasons take of the Creede, & alleaged to proue that the body of Iesus Christe is in heauen in place certaine, are friuolous: we answere, that therein they shewe, the reuerence they beare to the worde of God and his holy spirite which hath reuealed it vnto vs, and to his Apostles who haue pronounced it to vs.

To iustifie Gratian and the Canon which we alleage of S. Augustine, as prouing therby that the body of Iesus Christe muste necessarily be in a certaine place: We alleage

againe for more ample confirmation, the Maister of sentences, Lib.4. Distinct. 10. who reciting the selfe same texte of S. Augustine, vseth this verbe *Oportet*, and not *Potest*.

Where the Doctours alleage Iustine to proue that the myracles which were done when Christ appeared in the middest of his Disciples the doores being shutte, and when he walked vppon the waters, were done in his person. Wee maruell muche, that the Doctours doo yet repeate that, seeing the same Iustine (as hathe bene already aunswered them) saithe in expresse termes, that at the time when the saide myracles were done, there happened no chaunge in the body of Jesus Christ, which as it had bin necessary, if the myracles had bin done in his person: so wee confesse stil (as many times wee haue done) that the cause of the saide myracles, and the Diuine vertue of which they proceeded, rested in Jesus Christ, as when he healed the sicke that touched him, with other myracles recited in the Histories of the Gospelles, which were done by him, but not in him, but in the person of those that were healed. There is greate difference betwene those myracles, and them of his Transfiguration and Resurrection, which were done by his onely vertue, and in his proper person.

Vppon the importunate repetition whiche the Doctoures make, aswel touching the meane of ẏ byrth of our Lord Jesus Christe, as of the terme Aphantos: The Ministers no lesse to auoide the losse of time, than to greeue or trouble the Readers, sende them to their former aunsweres.

Wee maruell also that the Doctoures to proue their penetration pretended of two bodyes, and theire dimensions, will grounde their proofe and principell Argumente vpon the proper signification of the woord to Penetrate. For be it that by the French terme they woulde interprete the Greeke woorde Pierchestai, or the Latine woorde *Penetrare*, yet it shoulde be alwayes impossible to them to proue that which they pretend. And to shew it is so, in the Actes of the Apostles, chapter 12. 10. it is saide of the Aungel, and S. Peter, that they passed the firste & seconde warde. And in S. Luke, 4. 30. but he passed through the middes of them, and wente his way. And in S. Iohn 4. 4.

He must passe by Samaria: in al which places the Doctoures cannot finde that the terme Diercherstai (alleaged in the said places) may be any wayes applied to their penetration of dimensions, neither can they proue any more that the terme *Penetrare*, which the Auncient Translatour hathe vsed in 2. Timoth 3. may be referred to their said penetration.

We say further, that the Doctoures oughte not to finde it more strange, that Iesus Christ mounting into heauen with a body termined and limited, made himselfe opening to enter therin, than whē he discendes betweene the hands of Priests, singing their masses: for then as S. Gregorie saith, the heauens are opened to make him passage: albeit that according to their imagination his body be then separated from his measures & dimensions. The Doctors ought to haue contēted themselues with the answer which we made them vpon the similitude & parable of the Camel. For first they could no way proue that the saying of Iesus Christ vpon the end of the speach ought to be referred otherwaies than to the nert member of the same, where is spoken of the conuersion & saning of the Rich: seeing the Pronoune Demonstratiue *Hoc* shewes it clearly. After, notwithstanding the proposition generall whiche is vpon the end & cōclusion of ỳ said speach (that al things are possible to God) stretcheth aswel to the Camel, as to the rich men (as ỳ doctors hold) yet, to accomodate the two parts of the comparison, thei must confesse, that as changing is necessary to ỳ rich man to be saued, so is it also to the body of the Camel, to make him passe through the hole of a needle: but what so euer it be, & in what manner so euer that may be done, the doctors shal neuer proue or conclude by that, that two bodies may penetrate one an other. Because the doctors by their most mighty and strong Argumentes coulde not conclude any their said absurdities, nor enforce vs by force of their reasons to cōfesse them, they do nothing but crye blasphemie, blasphemie, the same being the last shift of al men that despite and whet their teeth against the Truthe, and maintainers thereof, when they can not ouercome them.

If we woulde subscribe to their errours and abuses, we

should be good and Catholike men: but bicause wee resist and reproue them, wee are (in their opinion) Heretikes, Seducers, Blasphemours, and Atheistes. Yea, they haue in vs such horrour, that it is maruel they rent not (as did Caiphas) their hoodes and hattes in spite of Gods woorde proponed & defended by vs, and condemned by them as Blasphemy.

The doctours haue dissembled our place of scripture alleaged to proue that faith is a worke of God, that it produceth in the hart of ẏ faithful, when he wil regenerate him, speaking by chaunge of Free wil, and Merite of Woorkes: wherein wee are determined to answere, and mainteine the truths of these two pointes, with Gods grace, againste the enimies of his glorye, when they shalbe proponed to be debated vppon. And touching the ioy that they say they haue receiued for that wee haue confessed to haue read in no ancient Authour, or expresse termes, that God cannot bring to passe, that one body in one instant be in diuers places: they haue no great cause to reioice at it, seeing that albeit the said ancients haue not spokē it in expresse speach, yet haue they both said and written it in termes equiualent, and that in infinite places.

*A shorte resolution of al the discourse and aunsweres whiche the Ministers haue made vppon the matter of Goddes Omnipotencie, in the conference which they haue had with the Doctoures.*

THe craft & art of Sathan hath bene alwaies from the beginning of the world, to trāsfigure him self into an Angel of light, & search some fine pretēce to colour & distinguish him self, as vnder such colour to insinuate into the church of God, & there to sette abroach his Lyes & trumperies: like as we see that vnder the colour to honor God, he hath established al the Idolatry which euer hath bin in ẏ world: laying the worshipping of Images, the inuocation & intercession to Saincts, ẏ veneration of relikes, & other like impieties, to ẏ honor of God, persuading the ignorante, that al ẏ was done to aduance him.

Vnder

Under pretence likewise of his seruice, he hath brought in all the contradictions and inuentions of men, and chaunged with the time, the true and lawfull seruice of God, (whiche consistes in the obedience of his Holy wil, as he hathe declared it to vs in his Lawe and his worde) into obseruation of their commaundementes & ceremonies by them inuented: vnder pretence and colour of the Sacramentes ordeined by God for confirmation, exercise and nourtour of the Faithe of his Churche, there is crepte in the Masse: which is not the ruine and absolute subuersion of the supper, but also an abolishment of al the benefites of Jesus Christe, and by consequent, of the Faith of all true Religion: vnder colour & shadowe of Holinesse, and vnder shadowe of chaste, shamefast, and honest conuersation, whiche is principally required in the Ministers and Pastours of the Churche, he hath established sterilitie or singlenesse, and hath taken from them al libertie of Marriage, which hathe bene the occasion of muche Filthinesse, Infamies, stinking & execrable Whoredomes, & Lechery, which are amongst ỹ Papists seene: vnder colour of Prayers, which wee are commaunded to make one for an other, and Charitie, by the which wee are bounde to succour the poore and needy, he hathe brought in Suffrages, whiche haue bene sung for the Dead, Merites and Workes of Supererogation, and other like Abominations: vnder colour of the day of Reste, which God hathe chosen and assigned to the sanctifying of his Holy name, to the contemplation of his Workes, to the recording and preaching of his benefites and fauours, he hath brought forth infinite prophane Holy dayes, in whiche Goddes name is blasphemed, his Ordinances corrupted, and his Alliance violated. Yea, who can number the wicked abominations whiche were committed in those dayes? vnder the pretence of the Keies and Discipline of the Church, vnder of the Administration and vse was giuen to the Ministers of lawful vocatiõ, as to haue a meane to preserue the Doctrine pure, to entertein a good order in the Churche, and to withstande the slaunders which might happen by the insolencie of others, he hathe established a

tyran-

tyranny, whereof is happened an entyre dissipation of the Church of God, a corruption of all estates, and the diminishing of the lawful authority which God hath giuē to Kings, Princes, and Magistrates, of whom some haue bene wholy spoiled aswel touching their goodes, as dignities by the Pope and his Bishoppes: and others so weakened, that they are constrained in many places to bowe their neckes, and lay it vnder their yoke and power. To be shorte, this may be noted and obserued in al the enterprises and actions of the Diuel, that as he is a Serpent, so hath he alwaies rauped, creeping as it were couertly vnder leaues and likelyhoodes of godlinesse into the house of God, to sowe there the disorder, confusion, and destruction which he pretended: wherein we see at this day, that continuing and following (as it were) his earnest, he bringes in the almightinesse of God (a title peaceable and fauourable to al the worlde) to the ende that vnder the honour and light of such an occasion, he may dimme the eies of the ignorant, and nussel them stil in the opinion & persuasion of their errours, which haue no ground in Gods worde. We beseeche the Readers, as all others also in whom remaines a feare to God and zeale to his honour, that with greate wisedome they consider of the saide artificiall practises of the Diuell, beleuing not all spirites afore they haue wel sounded and examined them: neither let them approue all things ỳ may be proponed to thē vnder the name of God, which at the first may seeme to resemble and appertaine to his honor & glory, but let them remēber the aduise of the Apostle, to trie and proue the spirites, with diligente regarde to the ende, and marke of suche as prepone them such doctrines. And if on any behalf & part we haue to stād vpon our garde againste suche suttleties and deceites, whiche are snares cast out to entrappe the simple, we haue special nēede of singulare regarde in this matter of Gods Omnipotencie, whereof the question lies at this present: for we confesse, that it oughte to be knowne, beleued, and worshipped of al creatures vniuersally that are in Heauen and earth: and that the faithful cannot haue a better grounde, nor better bul worke

to defende them aswell againste the force of the Diuell and the Worlde, as their other enimies, together with all other temptations wherewith they may be assaulted. Wee say, this Omnipotency is as the pointe of the Shield, vpon the which the worlde and al his partes is turned and holden vp. Wee confesse also, that this Almightinesse is not onely to be reuerenced of the Angelles and happy Soules in Heauen, and of the chosen and holy ones that are in earthe, but also to be redoubted of the reprobate, and Deuilles that are in Hell: whereof, the one sorte of frée will do folowe it, and submitte to it, and the other are constrained to stoupe vnder it, and obey. Lastely wee confesse that it is infinite, and of a greatenesse incomprehensible to all creatures, as the wisedome, bountie, iustice, truth, and other vertues and properties of our God.

This is it that which wée confesse and beleue of the Omnipotencie of God, as also that which wee thinke al Christians ought to holde and beleue. And nowe to vse rightly this Omnipotency, and apply it as apperteineth, wee must iudge of it according to his Wil, and of his Wil, according to his Word: so that we ought not to attribute indifferently to the power of God al things good & euil, ordered and disordered, conuenient and contrary to his nature, false and true things: But, the better to rule and leade the thoughtes and cogitations rising in our mindes of the Almightinesse of God, wee muste measure them (for our regarde) according to his holy Wil, beléeuing that it can not be limited, staid or hindred by any other wil or power, which wold or can be set againste it: which S. Augustine teacheth at large in many places, as in the fifth Booke of the Citie of God, Chapiter 10. where speaking of God, he saithe, that he calles him selfe Almighty, bicause he dothe all that he wil, and suffereth nothing onlesse he will it.

Also in his 21. Booke, Chapter 17. he calles him selfe Almighty for none other reason, than that onely he can do all that he will. Also in the Booke of the Symboll and Catec. Chapter 1. our God dothe all that he will, and that

is

is his Omnipotency.

Lastely in his Sermon 119. *De Tempore*, he is almighty, as doing all things which he will, and ordeines them to be done. These sentences with many other like founde in the writings of this good Father and other Auncientes, teache vs clearely the manner howe to make our profite of the Faithe wee haue in the Omnipotencie of God, which is, in referring it to his Will, and iudging his Will by his Worde, and not by false imaginations, whiche either our spirites maye conceiue, or others woulde propone to vs: as Sathan did to Jesus Christe, whom he wente aboute to induce to throwe him selfe headlong, vnder a vaine truste to be succoured by the Omnipotency of God.

And likewise the Monarchians, who vnder the colour and pretence of Gods almightinesse, which thei gathered of other myracles, would proue & establish their Heresies, and take away the personal distinction which is betwæne the Father and the Sonne: saying, that God being almighty, might by that reason make him selfe Father and Sonne altogether. There be also Anabaptistes in these later times, who vnder a vaine assurance they repose in Gods almightinesse, which hope that he can nourish them as he did the byrdes, will not incline to trauel. Many other such like or greater inconueniences may happen to al those, who hauing such wandring & dispersed thoughts of the omnipotency of God, would not restraine nor refer them to his wil: which we see is also happened to the Doctors, who seeking to measure Gods almightinesse rather by their imaginations, thã by his wil & word, are (as S. Paule saith) become vaine in their discourse, & their harts (forsaken of vnderstanding) are filled with darkenesse.

And as in seeking to behold the maiesty of God without ỳ limits & boundes which he hath appointed in his word, they are becom ouerwhelmed & engulphed in his glory: so thei are also fallen into ỳ which thei touched in their own resolution. that bicause they haue not taken Goddes Worde for theire guide, nor followed the Pathes and foteteppes of his Holy Spirite, they are swarued from Faythe, whiche

(contrary to the opinion of the Doctours) is not defaced nor reuersed by the consideration of creatures & workes of God (which are as mirrours of his glory and Diuinitie) if not, that by the same wee might be turned from the promisses of God, by the which wee are assured of his wil, and his Omnipotencie, which dothe warrante and assure to vs the effectes and accomplishmentes of this his Holy will: which maye be clearely seene and obserued in those that were sent by Moyses to espie and knowe the Lande of the Chananites: twoo of the which (Iosua and Caleb) could neuer be drawne from the truste they had put in their God, bicause that turning their mindes from the consideration of all such thinges as mighte kindle doubte in them (as from the strength and munition of Townes, the numbers, force, weapons, and experience of the Countrie men) they fired their mindes vpon the onely remembraunce and contemplation of the promisses whiche God had made them: where, (of the contrary) others forgetting the saide promisses, and considering nothing but what they sawe afore their eies, fell, and made to fal all the people with them into this cursed and damnable infidelitie, for the which they were so grieuously punished in the Deserte, and shut out of the entry and ioy promised by God to their Auncestours.

And in the example of Abraham, whose Faithe remained firme and stable, chiefly by the consideration of the promisse and will of God, as S. Paule saith, so that the consideration of Goddes Omnipotencie comes after, to sustaine and accompany that which he had of the promisse.

By these examples wee may see what daunger there is to departe and fall from (neuer so litle) the worde of God, by which wee are guided to the knowledge of his Will, and by the knowledge of his Wil wee are drawne to the consideration and iudgemente wee oughte to haue of his Omnipotencie.

For wante whereof, the Doctoures are fallen into the errours and madde fansies proponed to vs in their laste resolution, that the Body of Iesus Christe at one instant may be

in

in diuers places: which as it is contrary to the faith we ought to haue and holde constantly of the wisdome, prouidence, and eternall truthe of God: so likewise it is against the faith we ought to haue of ỹ humanitie of our Lord. Neither doth that serue any thing to proue and cõfirme their error, which they alleage chiefly of S. Ierome against Vigilantius, where his speeche importes no other matter, than that the soules of the holy ones, are inclosed in a certaine prisone (as Vigilantius dreamed) but doe accompanie the Lambe where so euer he goeth: neither that which they alleage of S. Augustine in his Booke of the care we ought to haue of the deade, seeing in the same Booke he himselfe confesseth, that he standes doubtfull of that which the Doctoures assure: and muche lesse the three authorities alleaged of S. Iohn Chrysostome, S. Ambrose and S. Augustine, whose sentences ought to be vnderstande of the sacrament, and not of the thing signified by the sacrament, as we hope to vnfolde at large in the nexte conference.

We marueil much that the Doctors draw backe thus, and will not enter but vnwillingly into the conference of their Masse, to defende it, as also of the supper celebrated in the reformed Churches, to impugne it. For, seeing they holde it as the principall grounde of their Religion, and propone it as a meane to saluation to all the world, therefore in respecte not to be found seducers or light to beleeue or teach a thing which is not certaine nor well assured, they ought to stand continually furnished with reasons, bothe to proue and defend readily that which they beleeue and teache, and also to conuince suche as would denie it.

But heere the worlde may discerne what is a wicked conscience, who being fearefull, eschues allwayes the light & combate: it is long since we haue urged them with importunities to enter into conference of these two pointes, and the rather to induce them to it, we haue alleaged, that it was the ende and purpose why the assembly was erected, and that the Dutcheese of Buyllon (in whose respect the companie mette) had required it publikely once or twice, like as also (for oure partes) we had often protested not to come thither in other

regarde than to satisfie the Ducheſſe in that point, and not to be examined by the Doctors, as they falſly pretende: For we delite not to go to ſuch Doctors to be examined to be prieſts: as alſo, to be taught in pointes of religion, and to knowe the truthe, we would not chooſe ſuche maiſters, nor haunte their ſchooles to ſuche ende: Notwithſtanding all which declarations repeated ſo often by vs, yet the Doctoures haue alwayes hitherto deferred to conferre of the ſayde pointes, erſpecting (as is moſt likely) ſome occaſion to diſſolue and ende the ſaid conference, afore there be any beginning to ſpeake of it: albeit, if they were ledde with any zeale to Gods honoure, and the edifying of his churche, they oughte to enforce by al their meanes, that theſe two pointes mighte be wholy reuealed and reſolued, whether in fortifying and confirming the faith on their partes, or to draw vs and our ſide from our erroure as they pretende: for there is no greate nede as nowe to diſpute of Saintes, of Purgatorie, of Pilgrimages, and other like pointes, in regarde of the which, the moſte parte of the worlde at this day is ſetteled and cleared: ſo that as well the Doctoures as we, oughte principally to inſiſt vppon the two pointes, and to labour with them to make them cleare and intelligible to euery one, and not to vſe ſophiſtries and cauillations to darken them, and ſo entertaine the ſimple in their ignorance: which is the whole indeuor of ỹ doctors: who hauing ſet ſpæche & mater, lay aſide our Articles proponed to them in their laſt Anſwers in order and good Methode, and put out confuſedly certaine queſtions gathered of their ſchole diuinitie, as to wrappe vs more and more in that matter: reſiſting herein (as they haue alwayes hitherto) that which they haue ſo many times protected, which is, to examine the confeſſion of the reformed Churches, of the which notwithſtanding they haue not handled one only point in all the conference, wherby as they haue, ſo ſtil they do declare euidently, their diſtruſt to be able to fight againſte a truthe ſo cleare and apparant, as is that which is proponed in the ſaide Confeſſion.

An

*An Answere to the Preface of the Doctours Questions.*

THe Doctoures in their Preface, and afore they propone their Questions, call the Supper which is celebrated in the reformed Churches, a banket prophane and polluted: wherin, without either shame or feare, they firste blaspheme Jesus Christe, which hath instituted it, and is the Originall Author, and then condemne the Apostles of impietie which haue celebrate and taught it, with all the Auncient Churche folowing and obseruing (whilest she dwelte in purenesse) the forme and manner which the Euangelists and Apostles had taught & left by their writings. But we would gladly require those our maisters, to note particularely, wherein we may violate the institution & ordinance of Jesus Christ, and leaue his example and the Apostles, in the celebration of the supper. For when we goe about to celebrate it, we assemble firste all the churche, as Christ did his Apostles and disciples, where, after confession of sinnes made publikely, & to be vnderstande in the name of all, we pronounce a Sermon to the people: wherin, according to the grace & facultie which God hath giuen vs, we declare the causes, occasions, purpose, vse, points, and effects of the holy supper, the rather to raise vp ỳ hearts of the people to consider the incomprehensible charitie which the father hathe shewed to his Churche, seing in hir fauor, and to saue hir, he spared not his proper sonne, but cõmitted him to a cruel death, accompanied with a curse: to the ende that euery one reuoluing in his minde so great a grace & mercy, might not onely be warmed & kindled in Gods loue, but also, abhorring the vnthankfulnesse, rebellions, faultes & sinnes which he hathe committed against his maiestie, might with grudge and displeasure against them, go thorow himself betweene the armes of his sonne stretched vpon the crosse, to the end to abolish them wholly and generally, and so wt faith & penance to prepare himself worthily to come to ỳ table of ỳ Lord, & receiue ỳ benefits which are there administred: this sermon being don, ỳ minister directing his face to the people, recites wt a loud voice, ỳ institution & ordinance of ỳ supper,

with

with a breefe and distincte declaration of the same, he then denounceth to all suche, as be not sufficiently instructed and catechised, that that is no place to present themselues to, and likewise to suche as be excommunicate or attainted of any sinnes and slaunderous crimes for the which they haue not satisfied to the Church, to abstain, as not to pollute the Lords table: After all which, he goeth to the table, where hauing taken bread, he giues thankes to God, breakes and distributes it to the people that are assembled: and so after, presentes the cuppe to all suche as communicate, the which being done, he yeldes thankes to God, and geues leaue to the people.

And thus, following in all respectes the example and rule giuen by Iesus Christe, we can not imagine whereuppon the Doctoures can grounde their saying and sentence of the supper, as to call it a feast prophane and polluted: nether can wee gather, what it is that they eyther coulde or wold reprehend in all our action, vnlesse peraduenture they woulde chalenge & taxe vs bicause we haue no Albes, Stoles, fannes, crosses, holy water, banners, tackets, lightes, incense, belles, and singing in an vnknowne tongue, muslike, organes, holy linnen, altares and clarkes to answere *& cum spiritu tuo*: or peraduenture because wee haue no direct wordes to the bread and wine (which are without eares) as the inchanters haue, nor crosse and signes, nor leuation of the breade and wine, to the ende to make them be worshipped, and lastly bicause wee vse not such like toyes, inuented by men, and drawne partly from the *Iewishe* and partly from the *Pagane* order in the obseruation of which things we should make great conscience, as being but Idolatries and superstitions, by the which the puretie and integritie of christian religion is wholly spoiled and corrupte.

*An Answere to the questions proponed by the Doctoures touching the Supper.*

TO Answere the first question we say, that the sacrament considered in his perfection, consistes in three things;

whereof the one is the Elemente, which Ireneus calles an earthly thing: an other the thing signified, named by the same Author a celestiall thing: the third is the worde, by the which the earthly thing is deputed or assigned to signifie the heauenly thing, and to assure suche of the exhibition of the same, as with faith present themselues to receiue it.

To Aunswere the second Question, we say, that the ordinance of God, contained in his worde, and declared by his minister according to his commaundement, is the worde necessary with the Element to constitute the Sacrament, and not only the secrete and base pronunciation of certaine wordes not vnderstanded addressed to the Elementes, nor any vertue that lies hid in them.

For Answer to the third Article, we say, that by the worde aforesaide the signes are changed, not touching the nature, or in respecte of the substance, but only in regard of the vse, and that only during the Action in the which they serue.

Touching the .iiij. question, we Answere, that the breade and wine which were common before the Action of the supper, be consecrated in the supper, that is, deputed by the worde aforesaide and ordinance of God declared by the minister to a holy and sacred vse: which is to represent and exhibite the things signified by them.

This Aunswere to the fourth, satisfieth also the fifth question.

To the sixth question, we Aunswer, that in the supper, the faithfull doe not onley receiue the giftes and graces of Iesus Christe (as his iustice, life, and other fruites of his sacrifice,) but also they receiue and possesse euen himself, and are made one with him, no lesse truely and strictly then the members be conioyned to one head: we say further, that this coniunction is the fountaine and meane, of all the benefites, which discende vnto vs by him through Goddes grace: But we say with all, that this receiuing oughte to be attributed in all and by all, to the free working of the holy Ghoste: who makes vs fitte and capable to knowe our Lord Iesus Christe, with all his vertues and proprieties, and in knowing him, to put oure

truste in him, and in reapposing our truste in him, to possesse and enioy him wholly.

To Aunswere the. vij. question, we say, that we reiecte and reproue the terme of concomitance, togither with the thing it signifieth: as being the occasion that the common people haue bene barde and secluded from one of the essential partes of the sacramēt: which is the participation of the cup: and we say, it is an attempt against the diuine maiestie, to seeke to seperate that which the sonne of God hathe conioyned, & denie to any of his membres ẏ which he hath willed and commaūded to be common to all: Like as also the reason of the sacrament requires it, the same being instituted for our spirituall nouriture, the which (as doth the corporal) consists in eating and drinking. To the end therfore ẏ there be a certain correspondencie betwæne bothe, it must be ẏ as we are filled with the crucified flesh of Jesus Christ, ẏ euen so also we be licoured wᵭ his bloud shed for the remission of sinnes: To be short, seeing ẏ supper was principally instituted, to declare ẏ deathe of our Lord, & that in his death, his blonde was deuided from his body: it is very conuenient the bread & wine be there administred, to represent both the one and other, & more clearly to prepound to vs the whole misterie of ẏ death of Christ.

To the. viij. Question, we acknowledge no other cause or meane for remission of sinnes, than the grace of God, ẏ bloud of Jesus Christ, & faith, by the which the effect of gods grace, & the frute of the death of Jesus Christ, are applied vnto vs.

Our Aunswer to the. ix. question is, that the faithful comming to the Supper, come not to receiue there a newe Jesus Christ: with whom they haue not bene conioyned before, nether a new iustice, which hath not bene cōmunicate to them: But we say, ẏ if any man present him self there, wout faith, by want wherof he was not vnited, incorpored, & knit in Jesus Christe to participate with his iustice, his life, & other his gifts and blessings, in this case ẏ holy supper is vnprofitable to him, as meat to a dead man: But, if liuing by the meanes aforesaid (by gods grace, the bloud of Jesus Christ, and faith) he present himself there in such estate, that then gods graces

are

are multiplied, cõfirmed, and increased in him more & more: as the Circumcision brought not to Abraham a new iustice, but sealed and ratified that which had bene communicate to him before by the promisse, the which being knowne to the faithfull, in what degrée of vertue so euer they be, ought not to mistake the holy supper, nor in any sorte abstaine from it, when they haue the occasion and meanes to assist it, considering that they cãnot be so farre aduaunced in the knowledge and feare of God, and in the faithe of his promisses, but that they may further profite and encrease therin (in what estate so euer they be) by the meanes which God hath lefte and ordained for this effecte in his Churche: neither is it possible that a man, hauing a true faith, in his heart, do otherwayes, hauing the commoditie of it: Bicause, the nature of faithe, is not to comprehend only the promisses of God, but also to engender and bring forthe in the hearts of the Faithfull, a wil to obey him, with obseruation of his commaundements and ordinances.

To Aunswere the first Articles proponed by the Doctors touching their Masse, we say they blaspheme openly Jesus Christe, as to authorise vnder his name, and by his example, such an abhomination: and that also they make a scoffe of the church and the world, to preach and wryte such impieties.

To the second Article of the Masse, we Aunswere, ỳ there is no other sacrifice in the church, by which men are reconciled to God, and which makes him mercifull and fauourable to them (in appeasing his wrath) than only that which Jesus Christe hathe once offred to his father vppon the crosse: the vertue of the which being eternal, to sãctifie all the beléeuing and obtaine remission of their sinnes for euer, there is no néede of any others, nor that that which he hath once offered, be euer repeated.

For Answer to the third Article, we say, that suche as approue the Masse, and other sacrificature, than that of Jesus Christ, and séeke to establish for remission of sinnes, an other Sacrifice than that which he himselfe offered in his bodie of the Crosse, are Antichristes, and deface (in so muche as in

them is) all the vertue and frute of the deathe and sacrifice of the Sonne of God.

To Aunswere the fourthe, we alleage that which S. Paule wryteth, that where is remission, there is no more Oblation for the sinne: And if it be so, that by the death of Jesus Christ, remission hathe bene obtained for vs, it foloweth that there is no more Oblation for sinne, neither in the Masse nor out of the Masse: And if there be none for the liuing, there is lesse for them that be dead.

For Aunswere to the fifthe, we maintaine that the Communion is of the essence of the supper according to S. Paule in the first to the Corinthians. Chap. 10. and. 11. and as the Canon and other partes of the Masse importes.

For Aunswere to the sixthe, we alleage three things: First that the Masse of the Papists is no Sacrament, and then, that the bodie of Jesus Christe is not there, and conclude thereupon, that there can not be worshipped therein but the breade and wine, which rest there: which being creatures can not be worshipped, but that suche as doe worship them, are Idolatrers.

To Aunswere the seuenth and last Article, we say contrary to the Doctors, that there is nothing in the Masse, which either directly or indirectly, is not contrary to Gods worde.

And for Conclusion, we aduise and praie the Doctoures, not to exceede or forsake the limites of the matter proponed this day to dispute vpon, as they haue done heeretofore, to the ende that these two pointes, which stande at this day in debate betweene them, may be perfectly and wholly decided, to the contentment and edifying of suche as shal read the Actes of this conference.

*Tuesday the. 30. of Iulie, the yeare aforesaid.*

# A summary Replie of the Doctours against the laste Aunswere of the Ministers, *sente to them by the Duke Nyuernois the firste of Auguste at seuen or eight of the clocke in the Euening. 1566.*

AFter wee had giuen our Resolution vppon the Article of Goddes Omnipotencie, wee ment not eftsones to returne vpon that Argument, as hauing already sufficiently handled it: but suche is the horrour of the newe Blasphemies conteined in the laste pamphelet of the Ministers, that (against our saide meaning) wee are forced, if not to reply, at the leaste to admonish them, together with the Readers of this presente conference, in the matter of the saide moste execrable blasphemies, with suche are vrged to confesse, who will not acknowledge the Reall presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in the Sacramente of the Aultare, are not ashamed to deny also euen the power of God him selfe.

The consideration whereof (as wee hope) will not onely confirme the Catholikes in the faith of the saide Article, but also (with Goddes aide) bring home againe many that are strayed and separated from the Catholike Churche, vpon the vnderstanding of the detestable errours and blasphemies succeeding with the contradiction to the Real presence of the Body of our Lorde in the saide Sacramente: whiche might also serue the Ministers for their conuersion, if without passion they woulde examine & sincerely iudge of the reasons & actes proponed touching the power of God: where, as resisting the Holy Spirite, in place to confesse their errours, they are turned into all sortes of wrongs and iniuries againste suche as of good will reuealed them, misconstruing our purpose, as not to tende but to deface and rote them out: wherin as wee were neuer moued so muche as in thoughte, so of the

contrary, we desired nothing more than the saluation of the Ministers, togither with all suche as were fallen from the true Catholike Churche: whereof, what better witnesse can we preferr, than that in our ordinarie preaching we persuade the people to pray to God for them: only we seeke to rote vp the raigne and kingdome of Sathan, and to abolish all heresies and peruerse Doctrine, rather by the preaching of Gods worde, than any other meane. And much do we maruel, that the Ministers seeme so hotly netled against vs in their laste Aunsweres, seeing it is without occasion on our side, as only chalenging many of our propositions to containe matter of blasphemy, which they might haue sufficed either to denie, or disproue, leauing the Readers to iudge, wout entring into so warme choler, seeing that as they make profession of pacience and modestie, so though they were urged in iniurie, yet they should not enforce reuenge. They ought to remember the goodly titles wherwith they honoure the Catholike doctrine, as with the name of superstition, idolatrie, impietie, abhomination and many other like, yea not sparing the persones, calling the Popes, Bishops and Priestes, Antichristes, and ministers of Sathan: Against which checkes we are cõtent, when occasion moues, to proue by Gods worde, that such titles are inconuenient no lesse to the persons, than to the Doctrine preached by them: And so albeit, the ministers e their furie, deserue a sharpe replie, yet to qualifie their Waspishe stomakes, we will forbeare to Aunswere the iniuries that touche our persons and estates, and leauing all to the iudgement of the Readers without passion, we will only procede to the pointes that concernes the Doctrine.

In the firste place, the ministers do great wrong to vs and ours, to resemble vs with the Donatistes, as imputing falsly to vs to drawe the Church into a certaine place as did the Donatistes, who placed hir onely in *Africa*: For it is moste manifest, that we neither knowe nor confesse other Churche then the Catholike, who (as the name beares) hathe bene visibly since the Apostles, and stretcheth throw all the worlde, in what Region, Countrey, or place so euer the faithfull be-

leeuing

leeuing in Iesus Christ, be: albeit we reuerence the Romish church, as, amongst others, the first and principal, as Irenæus Tertullian, S. Cyprian, S. Augustine, with other Auncientes, gaue hir this honor, to confesse hir principally, and as mother of all the other Churches: And therfore with farre more iust reason, that obiection might be applied against the ministers, who can not say that their Churche is Catholike, as hauing taken hir originall in our time, seene and knowne at *Geneua*, and founded vppon the priuate opinion of one man, without that, in any time before, it can be shewed that any suche opinon hathe bene holden in any nation what so euer, which shal be handled in his order, when we discende to examine the errors maintained by the Ministers against the Article, I beleeue the holy Catholike Churche.

For the rest, the Ministers oughte not to haue alleaged the violence, crueltie, and furie of the Donatistes againste the Catholikes: seeing suche example condemnes them and their like.

But bicause it doth but kindle a memorie of the hurts passed, which *Fraunce* hathe suffred by the setting on of the Ministers, and for feare to stirre vp ekfsones to newe wrongs, we will stay no longer vpon this speeche, shewing notwithstanding to the Ministers, that the Donatistes reproched the Catholikes to endure persecution by them, and that to rote them vp, they solicited Emperoures and Magistrates, as the Ministers doe euill applie to vs: who confesse to desire firste of all the Conuersion of all Sectes, and if they will not come to amendment, that then by good and holy lawes, the Magistrates to lay suche punishment vppon them, as God be not blasphemed, nor the people tormented, according to the Doctrine of S. Augustine in an Epistle sent *ad Vincentium contra Donatistas*, where he Confesseth that the Catholikes persecuted the Donatistes, as, of the contrarie, the Donatistes afflicted also the Catholikes: Onely their persecutions differed, for the Catholykes dyd not execute but by the Magistrates, and that proceeded of Charitie, to rote vp the euil which hindered the publike peace and tranquillitie;

where,

where, of the contrary the Donatistes persecuted without authoritie of the Magistrate, and proceeded of malice, pretending nothing but ruine and subuersion: S. Augustine allowes the firste to be good, and according to God, and the seconde he makes to be wicked, and of the inspiration of Sathan: wherin he brings many examples of the scripture: we haue stand somewhat long vppon this pointe, the rather to purge the slaunder which the Ministers haue laide vpon vs, as that in our preachings, wrytings, and conference, we haue not searched but their destruction, and alwayes to persecute them: construing it as a matter of particulare hate againste them, and not of charitie and zeale to the truthe, to conuert as wel the ministers, as suche as are seduced and abused by them: wherein we call God to witnesse, and protest all the contrarie, with requeste to the ministers to beleeue vs, attending Goddes iudgement vppon it, who is the only searcher of the heartes and affections of men.

Touching the Article, where the Ministers say that God is almightie, bicause he can doe all that he will: if they would haue red the wrytings of S. Thomas (whose Doctrine they disdaine) they should wel know that this reason is nothing: bicause the Angelles and suche as are blessed, being alwayes conformed to the wil of God, may doe all that they will doe, and there is no creature that cā hinder the effect of their wil, and yet they are not omnipotent: touching the saying of S. Augustine (taking it as the ministers do) the reason of Gods almightinesse is tw weake and false.

But to haue a true vnderstanding of this sentence, we muste consider, that there is difference betweene the will of God actuall, and the power of the wil, for God may wil many things, which he will not, nor neuer would: and therfore, he can will more then he will not actually, wherein we ought rather to measure his omnipotencie, then according to his actuall will.

In this sorte must we interprete the texte of S. Augustine, that Goddes omnipotencie stretcheth to all things, which he can will, and not according as he actually willeth: S. Augustine

sine also is recited by the ministers, being destitute of testimonie of the scripture, albeit in their former Answere they vaunt to haue taken that reason of the scriptures.

In the Article folowing, the ministers charge vs falsly, to haue curtailed some words of their last writing, which shall not be found true: For our text beares these words: it is undoubted that aboue all conceite and imagination of mannes spirit, Gods power is great, infinite, and incomprehensible: by which may be clearely seene, that we speake vniuersally of all conceite and imagination, without exception of any, whether it be of wisdome or of follie: therefore it was without nede to erpresse the wordes of the ministers, seing the Doctors spake generally: the which that which goeth before, dothe shewe, as the ministers haue recited it, where it is said that we reprehended them, in that they gaue some restraint and limitation of the omnipotencie of God: as not suffering it to stretch generally to all things that mannes wit mighte imagine or conceiue: where, in these wordes, generally, and all things, they declare that we would comprehende according to humaine iudgement, euen the foolish fansies and imaginations, which men may comprehend: And that we would not cutte of any thing of the writing of the ministers, who perhappes were of opinion that we would not say that God can doe all that a fonde braine can imagine, as fearing that we would inferre against them, that God could doe any folie: which should not folowe: for albeit in the iudgement of men, certaine things are esteemed fonde, yet seeing they are possible in themselues, they may be done of God, but wisely, notwithstanding the witte of man iudge the contrary: Like as in many iudgementes, man beguiles himselfe, esteeming that for follie, which is wisdome with God, as S. Paule saith. So that we say, that all things which are to be imagined by man, are to be done with God, without excepting any thing sauing suche things as implie contradiction to be and not to be, which can not be done in respecte of repugnancie proceeding of their parte, and not by faulte of the power of God: wherein we pray suche, to whome these conferences shall

come, to note that the ministers are allwayes found slaunderers, when they lay that crime vpō vs, like as in the former wryting they stande as conuinced therein.

The Ministers will also be founde slaunderers in the Article folowing, where they clippe our sayings, and falsly lay vpon vs to haue writtē that God cā do any thing against order: in deede we sayd, that to holde that God could do nothing against the order which he hath established in the worlde, is to blaspheme God: in which may be discerned the slaunder of the ministers, who mangling the speeche, haue taken away these wordes, established in the world: where they inferre that it is a blasphemie to say, that God may do a thing which is not well ordered, it is oute of doubte: but to doe any thing contrary to the order established in the world, importes not any thing disordered, but onely mutation and chaunge of order, without any disorder, which the Ministers confesse in their Article folowing.

We greatly abhorre the blasphemies cōtained in the nert Article, whereof the firste is, that one body be in diuers places, is a thing derogante to the truth of God, bicause in God there shoulde be yea and not: so that the Ministers hold that God should not be true, if he broughte to passe one body to be in diuers places, and yet they neither teache, nor can teache, that God hathe euer sayde that one body coulde not be in diuers places: it impugnes the wisdome of God, bicause in his workes, there shoulde be disorder and confusion, wherein likewise they confesse that God shuld not be wise, if he made one bodie at one instante to be in diuers places.

The thirde is, that suche thing resistes the omnipotencie of God, seeing in suche acte, there should be suche imperfection, that muche lesse (according to the opinion of the Ministers) that God in doing this, shoulde be omnipotent, but of the contrarie, he should be imperfect and impotiant.

The fourthe is, that if suche a thing were done, it shoulde be againste the eternall and immoueable will of God, and therefore God should be mutable: Oute of which blasphemies is necessarily vomited a manifest Atheisme, that God should

should not be God, if he made one body in one instant to be in diuers places: For God can not be but true, wise, almightie, and immoueable: which blasphemies we are content to coate and marke only, with admonishment how many miseries spring of their Doctrine that denie the Realt presence of the body of Iesus Christ in the holy Sacrament: and not to stay any more to confute them, as being too manifest, and hauing regarde with all, to the saying of Ireneus, that there be heresies, whome to discouer, is to refute them.

In the Article folowing, they resiste that with so many times they haue saide, that God coulde not bring to passe that one bodie be in two places at one instante, bicause it impugned the order which he hathe established in the worlde, as though God could doe no other wayes, than according to the order which he hath already established: and in this present Article they confesse that God can chaunge and alter the said order, out of which Confession we draw this argument: God can chaunge and alter the order, which he hath established in the worlde, and that withoute any preiudice to his truthe, his wisdome, power, and immoueable will: then he can chaunge the order by the which he hathe established (as the Ministers seeme to holde) that one bodie should not be but in one place, and to bring to passe (in the contrarie, the order being changed) that one bodie shall be in diuers places, and yet in that, there is no derogation to his truthe, wisdome, power and will: and by consequent that God of his omnipotencie may bring to passe that one body be in diuers places.

Touching the Article of the distinction of the willes of God, the ministers mumble all together, vnderstanding nothing in the saide distinction, no more than where they say, that a body to be in two places, is of ỹ societie of these things which God hathe declared by his worde, that he can doe nothing againste them.

First there is question of gods omnipotencie, which is referred to that which he can, & not to his essence, & that which is in himself: as is to be all one, wise, & good: which things belong not to the omnipotencie, but of the essence in him selfe.

Secondly, what reason is there to conferre the being of one body in one place, or to know whether God can make it to be in two or more places: with the essence of God which is one, incomprehensible, &c. seeing that such things being numbred, appertain to the essence of God: And to be able to make a body in many places belonges not properly to him, nor is referred to the same.

Thirdly, the ministers say that God by his worde hathe declared his will concerning that he was one, which serues nothing to the present matter: But pardoning them those follies, how dare they compare with the essence of God, that which is in contention, of the being of one body in one or diuers places: seeing God hath neuer sayd, that he could not do it, as he hath pronounced manifestly al the other perfections which appertaine to the diuine essence: by which may be espied, that it suffiseth the ministers to fill the paper, without grounding their opinion vpon any substantiall reason.

Seeing they take for reproche, when they haue any worde cutte of, notwithstanding the sense remaine whole, we marueil they feared not to receiue the like Obiections from vs: as in the Article where is mention made of the definition of a body, they conceale that which giues solution to their difficultie: we defined a body to be a kinde of quantitie constant of three dimensions, length, largenesse, and depth, which definition comprehendes all the essence of a body, which is of the predicament of quantitie: neither is there mention made of the circumscription of place in any sorte: the ministers say, that by our definition, we limite the body, and therefore it is circumscripte: but they haue left out this litle worde, place, maliciously, as is to be supposed.

For the question is not whether a body be limitted or not, seeing no man saithe it is infinite: But the Question lies, whether it be circumscript of place essentially, so that it cannot be a body, if it be not in place: wherin bicause they could not Aunswere to the argumente, they haue cut of that which was against them.

The foure next Articles, are worthy of no newe Replie,

and

and therefore we sende the Readers to that which hath bene sayd before: only, it is a great matter that the ministers hold that a miracle can not be done in the bodye of Jesus Christe, without chaunge of his nature, imposing that opinion vppon Iustine, who (as well as other Auncientes) hathe sayde and maintained, that the body of Jesus Christe, without chaunge of nature, did passe thorowe the doores, although the operation of the miracle was done in the nature of the bodye, without chaunging it, but in giuing it a qualitie and spiritual perfection, aboue the natural qualities of a body, that is suttelty.

With like boldnesse, the ministers call the Scripture for the place of the Camell to passe thorowe the eie of a needle, a parable and similitude: as they doe that of the supper, and al others which resist their errors: and to escape, they say, that God saues not the riche man, if he be not chaunged and conuerted: And so they say, he can not bring to passe that a Camell passe thorowe the eie of a needle without diminution and chaunge of his greatnesse: But the ministers doe not admonishe, that when oure Lord spake of the entrie of a Riche man into the kingdome of Heauen, he put not the difficultie properly in the entrie to the kingdome, but in the conuersion of the Riche man, whereby he may obtaine the entrie and possession of Heauen: wherfore when our Lord sayth that it is more easie to God, to make a Camell (or Cable) enter by the eye of a Needle, than a Riche man into the kingdome of heauen: he meanes to compare the conuersion of a riche man (which is impossible to men) to the passage of a Camell being in his grosenesse: otherwayes as there should be no likelihode of difficultie, so our Lorde would not say, that suche a thing was impossible to men: We say further, that we haue not produced this place, as to proue the penetration of dimensions properly, but to shew that God may bring to passe that a body occupie a place, which shall not be proportioned to his greatnesse: which is as muche againste the nature of grose and thicke bodies, as that one body be in diuers places.

Where the ministers glory, in that they are not constrained to confesse any thing of the doings of God alleaged out

of the scripture by the Doctors: it followeth not that the said Doctors haue brought forthe vaine reasons to enforce and conuince them, referring themselues to the Acts of the conference: And touching to know if God could do such miracles alleaged aboue the nature of a body, the ministers can not escape, what euasion so euer they pretend, that they are not conuinced to haue denyed as well the power as the fact: though not openly, yet at the least couertly: For affirming that God can not bring to passe that one body be in diuers places, bicause it dothe impugne the order he hathe established in the worlde, his wisdome also and his will, which dispose all by good order, and that it was against the nature of the bodie: if there may be as muche saide, as truely there may, of all the other things mentioned touching a body, with like reasons: in confessing the one, they must necessarily confesse all the other, as containing like reason, whereunto the ministers haue secretely accorded, being not able to giue any difference, nor shewe why God can not doe the one, and be able to doe the others: And albeit they will neuer confesse the debt, nor yelde as ouercome, as they vaunt, yet there is no maruell, seeing it is the nature of Heretikes to become obstinate, and resist the truthe, what reasons so euer are proponed: The Scribes and Pharisies neuer confessed to be ouercome of the Lord, notwithstanding his arguments were irreprocheable: Likewise, albeit, such as contended against S. Steuen, had no more to answer, yet they forbare not to resist the holy spirite ỳ spake in him: euen as the ministers resiste the selfe same holy spirite speaking by the scripture, & the mouth of the Ancient fathers of miracles done in the body of Iesus Christe aboue nature, which the ministers impugne I know not by what vain and friuolous escapes. Touching this matter, S. Ierome saith, *heretici conuinci possunt, non persuaderi*: As also Tertullian. *Duritia hæretica vincenda est non fundenda*: And touching the iniuries which the ministers multiplie in this behalf against vs, in that they followe all the aduersaries to the truthe, and giue God testimonie, what disquiet of minde suche kinde of people suffer, when their errors are laid afore them, of whom suche is

our

our pitie, ỹ we pray God to restore them to their good minde, as knowing that the Conuersion of an heretike, is one of the things reserued to the omnipotencie of God.

The ministers labor in vaine to produce much Greeke, to shew that *penetrare cœlos*, signifieth not to passe the Heauens without opening, bicause this verbe, *Dierchesthai* is found to passe where is opening: But we neuer said that *penetrare*, or *Dierchesthai* can not be applied to places opened, or that in opening them, they were pierced thorow: For we know in all Authors that doth encounter: We said, that as the ministers would inferre the Reall opening of the heauen by the rigor and propretie of the verbe *aperire*, so might they alleage that the heauens were shutte in the Ascention of Iesus Christe by the verbes *Dierchesthai*, and *penetrare*, signifying with rigor, to pierce or passe thorowe, without that of it selfe, it importe opening, notwithstanding it may be vsed, where is a place open: But by the rigour of their signification, opening can not be necessarily inferred, if, by some worde, from elsewhere, or euident condition of the thing that is pierced, the opening be not shewed: as it is in the textes alleaged by the ministers: In the Ascention these Verbes *Dierchesthai* and *penetrare* be vsed, as to pierce, neither is any worde added, which importe diuision of the heauens: whose condition, nor the estate of the glorified bodie of Iesus Christe, doe not enforce any necessary vnderstanding of opening to be made, to suffer the saide body of Christe to enter.

Therfore we argued of the rigor of *penetrare*, as the ministers did of the wresting of *aperire*, which is founde in the scripture, and not to signifie a Reall opening of the heauens, more often than *penetrare* is red in the Scripture to signifie diuision or actuall seperation of the heauens: for *aperire cœlos*, is founde very often for spirituall and imaginatiue opening: and *penetrare cœlos*, is scarcely euer taken for actuall diuision of the Heauens.

And therfore better was our reason to conclude by the rigor of the verbe *Dierchesthai*, or *penetrare* (to passe wout actual diuision of ỹ heauens) than ỹ ministers to infer ỹ opening of

the same, by wresting the Verbe *Aperire*.

In the last Article, the ministers obiecte to vs to haue passed ouer certaine places of scripture, by which appeares that Faithe is a worke of God: whereunto we say, that in some of our wrytings we haue expressly confessed that Faithe, in that it is a gifte of God, is a worke of God. But in that he that beleeues, workes with God in beleeuing, (for *Nemo credit nisi volens*) it is a humaine worke: and it is not repugnāt, one selfe worke, for diuers considerations, to be a worke of God, and a worke of man. And where they bring the Auncientes to haue sayde (if not in proper termes, yet in like) that God can not bring to passe that a body be in diuers places: that is false: for they neuer either coulde or can shewe it, as also they gainesay their laste wryting: for, bringing the reason why the Auncientes saide it not in expresse termes, they alleaged it was bicause they neuer thoughte suche absurditie coulde fall into the braine of man: which reason ought to take place, as well to speake it in termes like, as in expresse termes, seeing it is one selfe thing signified as wel by the one as by the other.

For the rest: the ministers neuer Aunswere to the principall, whereof they haue bene often warned, and ofttimes we doe admonishe them, although they terme a thousande times our speeche, matter of repetition: it is, that we require them to bring scripture to proue that it impugnes the order established in the world, the truthe, wisdome, omnipotencie, and immoueable wil of God, one body to be in two places: which they can not doe, but Aunswere according to their custome, nothing: wherein may be discerned, that their Doctrine is not founded vppon Gods worde, but vpon their proper opinion, or particulare inspiration, which can not be but of Sathan: for being contrary to the common consent of the vniuersall Churche, it can not be of the holy Ghoste. And vppon the same are founded also the other Articles of their Religion, albeit they disguise and promise at euery worde, the worde of God.

*A short aduertisement of the Doctors vpon the resolution of the Ministers touching the omnipotencie of God.*

WE maruaile of the maner of speeche and writing vsed by the Ministers, who since the beginning of the conference, could neuer endure to pursue & conclude one onelye point, without entermedling of others which belonged nothing to the matter of the question as maye appeare by the reading of their Actes: Wherein afore they set downe their resolution of Gods omnipotencie, they heaped together as many Articles as they coulde remember, and thrust them one vppon an other, without occasion and reason. Notwithstanding (vpon their owne request) we had set afore them articles of the Supper: yea to the intent that after we had disputed of the almightynesse of God (to make present the body and blood of Iesus Christ in the holye Sacrament) we might discende by order into the declaration and proofe, that suche was Gods wyll, and also that he is there: But we are not ignorant of the good customes of those of the religion pretended reformed, to blow in the eyes of the Christians, all the articles of their religion, together with the polutions they inuent thereupon all vppon one lyne, to the ende nothing be determined, but all rest in confusion, and that the Serpent runne away when he hath vomited his poyson.

Besides by the obseruation of their aunswers, it is to bee discerned, that they neuer rested vpon any certaine and selfe aunswer: But to euerye question they haue returned aunswers no lesse diuers than impertinent, and sometimes not to be suffered: of the which we giue warning to all suche as shall reade the conferences, and laying our selues vppon their iudgement, beseeche them to haue good regard to the doinges of the Ministers side.

Moreouer, we tell the Ministers, that either they may or ought to know, that all the sectes of our time bleare the eyes of such as they meane to blinde with the selfe same traine of articles which they haue gathered together in their resolution, and that to obtaine audience in the catholike Churche,

and to bring in theyr errours and heresies vnder the name of Gods glory. Of the which they vaunt them selues to be protectors no lesse than the Ministers: wherein, lyke as notwithstandyng all these, they are not to be receiued or allowed in their opinions and conclusions, so the Ministers cã not pretend any right to exalt the power & glorye of God by such a confusion and hotchpotche of all matters together.

Moreouer we let the Ministers vnderstande that wyth better reason we could returne vppon them the conclusion they pretende to inferre of the subtiltye and art of Sathan, the same being (as they write) that vnder a godlye pretence of pietie, Sathan (in the maner of a Serpent) slides into the Church of God, to the ende to plant their disorder, and at last to set vpon euen God himselfe. Let euerye one see and consider in himselfe, if this be not the true enterprise of the Ministers, both by their deductions, and generallye the principall poyntes of their doctrine. For vnder a faire pretence to rote vp certayne abuses and errours, whiche falsely they seeke to persuade the world to be in the catholike Church, against Gods word, and vnder colour of preaching, that they searche to exalt the name of the Lord, they go about to dispoyle God of hys properties and perfections, notwithstanding they declare it not, no more than Sathan opened his intent to the first man.

The Ministers besides deface the merite and efficacye of the blood of Iesus Christ, and by their doctrine open the gate to all vices and synne. For proofe wherof, albeit we should spare to repeate what they haue holden of the power of God, yet their writinges stand as their accusers: onelye in good resolution (although they vtter faire speeche) God can doe no more, as they holde, than it pleaseth them to receiue of hys wysedome and wyll, which they disguise after their sense, when it is founde declared in the scripture. Agaynst the bountye of God they hold, that he is author and worker of euyll and synne. Against his mercy they teache that he neyther doth nor wyll pardon a man that hath impugned by malice the knowledge of the truth, or resisted it.

Against

Against the merite of the blood of Iesus Christ, and passion of the crosse, they haue written in proper tearmes, that if Iesus Christ had dyed onelye by the anguishes of corporall death, and the effusion of all his blould, he had done nor profited nothing for our redemption: If being vpon the crosse, and afore hys death, he had not endured the payne of the damned in his soule, with other horrible blasphemies contayned in the article of his discention in to hell.

They instruct also their adherentes, that manslaughter, adultery, robbery, theft, sacriledge and all other crime what soeuer, are but veniall synnes to the predestinate, whom they say are neuer out of Gods grace, whatsoeuer they do. Assuring their faythfull, and such as stand in their Church, to beleue constantly that they be in grace, and predestinate, which in playne speeche (though they would otherwyse excuse it) is to giue full licence to do all euyll: With sundry other articles whiche we intende to verifie, as the matter requires. But if they denye these poyntes to bee wrytten and published in their secte, the places in Calums bookes, which we haue noted in the Margent, are to giue witnesse. In effect that is the glorye of God, and hys Sonne Iesus Christ whereunto the Ministers incline and tende, by the extirping of the pretended impieties mencioned in manye articles of their last resolution.

To aunswer the which in short speeche, we saye, that some are spitefullye and falselye layed vppon the catholyke Churche by the Ministers, others be expresselye written in holye Scripture, and others drawne out of the same, and confirmed by the tradition of the Apostles, and vniuersall consent of the first Christian churche: except the slaunderous impositions which in euery article the Ministers do adde. And so in tyme and place we wyll declare and proue by peecemeale, if the pacience of the Ministers wyll consent to handle euerye difficultie in hys place. But if they continue to cauell withall to put confusion in the doctrine, we protest to aunswer them with scoffes.

For the rest, they bable much of Gods power in general, alledging that we ought to take certaine knowledge of it by the Scriptures, whiche wee haue alwayes aduowed vnto them. They say also that it is infinite and incomprehensible, but when we offer particularities, to knowe wherein omnipotencie consistes, then they forget the holye scriptures, and without them measure it according to the wisdome and eternall wyll of God, and the order established in the world: yea and as if they were without all remembraunce, that that almightynesse were infinite, they wrest it to a condition, propertie, and naturall order of creatures: as if to do anye thing against or aboue the order, condition and naturall propertye of the sayd creatures, were a thing repugnaunt to the wysedome, nature, and wyll of God. This is the short resolution which we may gather of their opinion touching the omnipotencie of God, the same appearing in their papers and answers giuen to vs, wherin, touching S. Augustine produced by them, we haue sufficiently answered before.

Where the Ministers lay vpon vs to hold as a sufficient argument, that a case being done of God, declares that hee could do it, we referre our selues to our writinges, whereof our resolution and obiections containe all the contrarye.

We are also slaundered by the Ministers, to affirme that faith contrarieth nature euery way: onely we sayd, that ordinarily the contradiction done to fayth, founded vppon the worde, proceedes of the consideration of thinges naturall against the power of God.

Touching Abraham, the scripture of *Genesis* wytnesseth alwayes, that hee and hys wyfe made a certaine difficultye touching the promise of God: and considered corpus suum emortuum, et mortuam vuluam Sarræ vntyll he hearde the assurance of the omnipotencie, as also S. Paule speakes ynough of Abraham, since his first vocation, till after that assurance, without putting distinction in the historye of that which was afore or after suche assurance, according to the saying of the Apostle, that he did not consider corpus suum emortuum, resting vpon the assurance of the power and promise

mise which had bene made to him.

We say, we haue better concluded touching the fayth we ought to haue of the power of God (to make one body in diuers places) than the Ministers, who haue no word of God to assure their faith and beliefe that God cannot do it, or that it impugnes his wisedome, prouidence, and eternall vertue, or the humanitie of Iesus Christ, yea onely the nature of a simple body: But touching all this, the Ministers truste in their presumption and particular reuelation, without one onely place of the scripture, whereupon they maye settle or rest their opinion: Where, of the contrary we haue grounded our faith (not onely touching the power of God, to bring to passe that a body be in diuers places, but also to beleue the fact, and that God would it so) vpon the holye Scripture, as appeares in our resolution, together with the places of the auncientes alledged for that purpose, the same being so manifest, that as the Ministers are not able to gainsay them, so touching their escapes, they are to be conuinced by the simple reading of the bookes.

Touching the residue of the Ministers resolution (containing many iniuries, slaunders, and wronges against vs) we answer nothing, hauing regarde to the maner of their doinges. Like as also we consider, it should be but paine lost to teache the Ministers, who for their instruction, esteeme more their particular reuelation, than all the doctrine of the vniuersall church, and all the Christians together. And lastly we pardon them with all our heartes, all the wrongs they haue done vs, as beyng people estraunged from their full sense, and without iudgement, which they well declare by the maner of their doing.

*The Doctors obiection touching the Supper against the Answer of the Ministers.*

IT appeares sufficiently in the actes of the first dayes arguing, why in the beginning of the conferences, we touched not the articles of the supper: wherein the Ministers

do maliciously slaũder vs, in saying we refused to enter into the matter of the same: as is truly proued, as well by our sundry offers made to them to conferre thereof verbally, to the ende to aduaunce it with more speede, and so at leysure to set it downe in writing (which the Ministers refused) as also by our former obiections touching the article of the almightynesse. By these we touched the groundes, wherupon are builded the errours of the religion pretended reformed, against the reall presence of the body and bloud of Iesus Christ in the holy Sacrament. The same being to be iustified further, in that wee obiect to them certayne argumentes agaynst their Supper, the rather to make them enter into it: To the whiche eyther they haue aunswered nothing at all, or at least so impertinentlye, that euen the wordes of their aunswer discouer their disposition to flee the combat. As yet they continue by their last writings, hiding, so farre as they can, that which they thinke of the supper: notwithstanding they haue bene required to aunswer both to purpose and truth. But whether they or wee refused, the effect standes to iudge. For though they wyll not aunswer, yet we wyll not forbeare to aduise them, and reueale to the whole world the intollerable errours, aswell in the Supper, as in all the doctrine of the Ministers: Who being asked, yet dare not confesse and iustifie what hath bene written by the inuenters of their supper.

But now to begyn to speake of the supper, the Ministers mayntaine it celebrated, according to the ordinaunce of Iesus Christ and maner with the Apostels, vsed in all the primitiue Churche, when she flourished, and whylest she remained in her pureneste.

Whereunto we aunswer with this question, howe manye worldes they thinke that the doctrine hath remayned in her pureneste touching the Supper, and whether as then the Church stood not as pure in the doctrine of al the other Articles, as in this? Besides, whether since that tyme there was not found any place through the whole worlde, where

the

the true doctrine of the supper, and the other Articles, was retayned and preserued: As also in what place, and by whom, from world to world, it was preached and aduaunced: In these we desire to be satisfied by the Ministers; as importing muche, bicause that afore Caluin preferred hys Catechisme, there was no memorye in any Region of suche doctrine as he taught, neither was the supper celebrated in the maner it is now in the reformed Church.

And we woulde gladlye relieue the Ministers, who in their writinges seeme straungelye passioned, that we haue sayde that their Supper differs not from a common Banquet, sauing that it is worse, as beyng prophane and polluted.

But to encounter this, they make a great speake of all the action of their sayde Supper, and by goodlye accessories, carying a forme of all pietie, they labour to make it highlye commended: couering a goodly nothing betwene two platters. And of the contrarye to treade downe and deface the most precious sacrifice of the body and bloud of Iesus Christ in the Masse, by tearing in peeces some accessorye of the same, as though wee vsed it without reason and signification, whiche the Ministers eyther vnderstande not, or dissemble not to vnderstande.

But as thynges ought not to be taken and esteemed by their accessories, but according to their value, nature, and truth: so the Ministers haue to foresee, that all the sectes standing at this day in all the worlde against the catholike Churche, for the matter of the Sacrament, vse at least thys brauerie that they do. Who if they were asked, there is not one of them which would not enforce to proue, that their sect approcheth nearer Iesus Christ, hys Apostels, and the primitiue Churche, than the Religion pretended reformed. Touching all which, we referre our selues to the writinges of the Lutherians, Zwinglians, Anabaptistes, Trinitaries, Master Alasco, with other lyke.

Therefore

Therefore it is not reasonable by these faire voyces and speeches, to preferre the supper of the Ministers afore other sectes, with iudgement that it is good, holye, impoluted, and according to gods word: but rather to repute it infected and defiled with impiette, as couering a dreame in place of truth, and giues the accessaries of pietie, to impietye and falshode. Neither haue we dispraysed their Supper, for the thankes they giue to God, or in respect of their confession of sinnes, or their preaching (if it containe matter of truth) or for any other preparatiue: But in this haue we named it to be detestable, as not containing but common bread and wyne, contrary to the ordinaunce of Jesus Christ: and yet they attribute vnto it some spirituall effect, with other godly accessaries of pietie: the same being a matter of more abominatiõ, and inuented by Sathan, who seekes by suche maner of supper, to quenche and abolish the true supper according to the institution of Jesus Christ, and rob the faythfull of the fruite and truth of the said true supper, in making them giue onely common bread, in place of the body and bloud of our sauiour Jesus Christ.

Here we could recite the wicked accessories, as well as they speake of the godly, which are in their supper, as the secrete and newe enterprises which are practised vnder colour and shadowe of the assemblies drawne together at their sayd supper: but leaft the Ministers reproche vs, that the Clerke speake of weapons, of contributions. &c. we wyll altogether hold our peace, and referre our selues to that which is: contenting our selues to deduce certayne causes, by the which we maintaine that there is no truth in the sayd Supper, according to the institution of Jesus Christ.

First, that in the supper of the Ministers and their lykes, there cannot be made any consecration of the matter of the bread & wyne, which are there propoled: and therfore there is not made in the sayd matter anye mutation either before the vse, or in the vse, or after, and by consequente, that the bread and wine in that Supper cannot be but common.

That there is no consecration made in their Supper, it appea-

appeares first by this, that it belongs not to al persons to cõsecrate the bread and the wine in the supper: but only to such as are lawfully ordained by the impositiõ of the handes of the Pastors and Bishoppes, according to the succession since the Apostles till our time. And it is moste certaine that the most parte of the ministers of the supposed reformed church, are not ordained by the authoritie of the handes of the Pastors, who haue power by succession of one to an other, since the Apostles: So that we must conclude, that suche ministers usurping the office that pertaines not to them, can not make any consecration, and by consequence, they giue but commen bread and wine: of which Article shall be spoken, when we handle the sacrifice, and priesthode.

Secondly, to make consecration of bread and wine, it sufficeth not that the person be fit to consecrate the matter, but it is also necessary, that by a certaine meane the lawfull minister make the consecration, which is, by Benediction and pronuntiation of certaine wordes vpon the matters proposed, as Jesus Christe did firste observe, wherein, bicause the ministers, albeit they were lawfully ordained, and had authoritie and power to consecrate, do not vse Benediction and pronuntiation of certaine wordes vppon the Breade and Wine, (impugning first that which Jesus Christe did, and after left it to the Apostles and their successoures to doe so) they can not pretende any consecration of the Breade and Wine, nor that in them doe come any mutation: whereof it foloweth, that as they differre not from other Breade and Wine, so that banket and feast is but common, and that it is blasphemie to attribute to it the name of Christian Supper: And this is a partie cause, why we said the ministers supper was a banket prophane and polluted.

We haue required the ministers to Aunswere pertinently and fully, to our Demaundes, which bicause they haue not done, to the ende to intercept all vaine trauaile, we thinke it not good for the present to impugne their Aunsweres: only we summon themselfes to Aunswere that which is proponed to them, without shifting of the conference which they

pretend to holde in so deare regarde.

The first Demaund was general for all the Sacraments to weete, if the ministers beleeued that two things were essentiall and necessary to the confection of the Sacramente: which are: the matter or element, and the worde: the Ministers Answere, that the Sacrament considered in his perfection, consists in three things. &c. they speake indeterminately, so that it can not be iudged, if their speeche vnderstand the Sacrament only, which they call of the Supper, or generally of all, as they were asked: albeit in respecte they alleage Ireneus, it may be easily gessed that they meane not but the Sacrament of the Supper: we haue also to note the wordes of their Addition, considered in his perfection, as alwayes to haue a hole to creepe out when we speake of the essence of the Sacrament.

We demaunde that they Answere to the Question proponed in general of all the Sacramentes, seeing there is like reason touching the essence of the Sacraments in generall: and that also they declare openly, what things are essentiall and necessary in the Sacrament, to be made a Sacramente, without speaking for the present of the perfection of one Sacrament, containing the essence and spirituall frutes, which are not of the essence of the Sacrament.

Touching the seconde Demaund, the Ministers Answere no more pertinently, than to the firste: And specially, where we made a Demaunde that certaine wordes muste be vsed for the confection of the Sacramente, and what was necessary for the Sacramente of the Supper: the ministers haue sayde, that the base and secrete speeche of certaine wordes addressed to the Elementes, was not a necessary speeche to the confection of the sacrament: We did not Demaund whether that speeche should be pronounced high or lowe.

But the Question was, if there be any necessary speeches to make the sacrament, which ought to be pronounced vpon the matter, or in administring the matter: and what might be those wordes for the supper: wherin it is not inoughe to say, that the word by the which the ordinance of Iesus Christ

is

is declared, is the worde of the sacrament, But they muste Answere in what wordes that speeche consistes, and when it ought to be pronounced.

Touching the sixthe Demaunde which is the principall, the ministers care not to Answere pertinently and clearely: only they exhibite a captious Answer, by which it can not be perceiued what is their opinion of the presence and participation of the body of Jesus Christe in the supper: And so doe they temper their speeche, that there is neither Zuinglian, nor Almanist, which confesseth not as muche or more than they, that is to say, that they are conioyned to our Lord Jesus Christe, and that they possesse him in vertue of their Faithe, and by the operation of the holy Ghoste, as to be made flesche of his flesche, and bones of his bones. &c.

But it is farre from the question, which was, if in the sacrament of the supper, the Faithfull receiue in their soules, besides all the spirituall graces (amongst the which is communication with our Lord Jesus Christe) the true bodie and the true bloude of him, Really, truely, and touching the substance: And if in the supper, the Ministers make not distinction of the substance contained and perceiued in the Sacrament, from the frutes and effects which procede therof: And to be short, we aske, if the Ministers receiue and allowe, that which Caluine in his Catechisme, Institution & other Bokes hathe written of the Supper, and that whiche is receiued therein.

Touching the seuenth Demaund, the Ministers haue not vnderstand what was proponed to them, touching the concomitance: for they haue taken it as if the Demaund ran, whether it was lawful to receiue the sacrament, vnder one kind or not: which was not ment nor put in question: onely this was the difficultie that was proponed to them, whether in their supper, when the bread is receiued, and afore the wine be receiued, they participate really with the true body of Jesus Christe, and not participate with his bloud, till they haue taken the wine, or, whether, in eating the bread, the bodie be receiued, afore the cuppe be taken.

To which Demaundes, to the ende Paper be not spente and moiled for nothing, we admonishe the ministers to Answere without swaruing or varietie, and yelde open Confession of their Faithe: And that we may knowe what Doctrine we may impugne or approue.

Touching the Articles of the Masse, we reserue them to their proper places, which is of the Sacrifice of the body and bloud of Jesus Christe, after it be knowne and proued that they are present in the supper, and holy sacrament.

*Sunday the fourthe of August, the yeare aforesaide.*

# An Answere of the Ministers,

to the vvryting of the Doctours, sent vnto *them by the Duke of Nyuernois, the Wedensday morning, the seuenth of August. 1566.*

THe Ministers forbearing all that is superfluous and immateriall, in the wryting of the doctors, as their repetitions: and dissembling withal, their wrongs and accustomed scoffes, (by which they proue muche better the spite they beare to the truthe, and vs, then the questions proponed) we will rest only vppon the pointes which seeme to require Answere.

In the first place, we denie to haue imposed vpon the Doctors, that they haue drawne and restrained the Church into a certaine place, but rather to a certaine company, and to the traditions giuen, followed, and approued by the same: wherein we praise God, that the saide Doctoures are come now to acknowledge that the Catholike Churche stretcheth thorowoute all the worlde, and that it is not enclosed within bounds

and

and limites of the authoritie and traditions of the Romishe Churche: which as we confesse was highly esteemed of the Auncients, when errors, abuses, and vices did not abounde in it, (as is happened since.) So nowe, being so corrupted as well in manners as in Doctrine, as nothing is more hateful than the worde of God, the light, the truthe, and vertue: we say, that as the estate of the saide Churche hathe bene chaunged, so also oughte the value and reputation, wherin it hathe dwelt: And yet in what degree of honour so euer it hath ben raised in times passed, the Auncients neuer esteemed it an vniuersall Churche nor hir Bishop, an vniuersall Bishop: as appeareth by that which S. Ierome writes to Euagrius, and the resolution of one of the Councels of *Carthage*: And touching the reformed Churche in *Fraunce*, we say not that it is the Catholike and vniuersal Churche, but only a member of the same, and that shee hathe hir foundation, not vppon the opinion or Authoritie of men, but vppon the Doctrine and writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

For the rest, touching the protestations of charitie & zeale by the which the Doctors feare to be driuen forward into the inuectiues and pursutes which they raise againste vs and other the Faithfull, by the example (as they say) of S. Augustine and other Bishoppes, who not long since solicited the Magistrates against the Donatists: Their proceedings which they haue and doe vse against vs, and other the Faithful, reueale plainely inoughe, that with false shadowes they couer themselues with those examples: Bicause euen the Catholikes, which they alleage, persuaded the Magistrates to vse moderation and softnesse to the Donatistes and other Heretikes, proouing all meanes to reduce them, afore they ministred the rigor of paines and iudgementes, enforcing themselues furthermore to bridle and represse the fury of the people, that they should not be put to the spoile, and ouerrunne: Where they (of the contrarie) sharpen againste vs bothe the people and Magistrates, and that by slaunders and false imputations, with all other meanes they can suborne to that ende.

Touching the omnipotencie of God, and the Diffinition we haue laide of ỳ same, drawne out of S. Augustines bookes: the Doctors in their laste wryting inferre no newe thing, to driue vs from it: For, that which they alleage of the Angels, to be able to doe what they will, and therefore to be almightie as well as God (if the diffinition aforesaide of Gods almightinesse had place) is no Crample either to the presente purpose, or to proue that there is in Angels, a power equall with God: seeing it is moste certaine that their wil and power depende elsewhere, and that God rules ouer them, to chãge, suspende, and stay them, as it pleaseth him, and as he can doe to all other creatures: which can not be saide of God without blasphemie. But, be it in what sorte so euer, if they will reprehende the diffinition of Gods almightinesse proponed by vs, it is not with vs, but with S. Augustine that they haue to doe: for the saide diffinition was taken worde by worde out of his wrytings.

We muche maruell, that, hauing so amplie auouched to them our opinion of the omnipotencie of God, with declaration, that it stretched indifferently to all things which mens fonde fansies coulde conceiue or imagine, that yet they will eftsones regrate vpon that pointe, alleaging that God can do wisely that, which the foolishe imagine fondly.

For it is moste manifest that Fooles may imagine many things which are impossible to God: As, (for crample) that God is not, as is written in the Psalme. 14. and. 53. that he is corporall as the Anthropomorphites did deeme: that the worlde is eternall as the Peripaticiens did teache that there be two Princes, as the Manicheans held: All which things can not be attributed to the omnipotencie of God withoute blasphemie: But in this are we best contented, that touching this Article, our maisters after long and sharpe debate, with so many blasphemies euen when we stode in the truthe of it, are yet constrained in the ende to consent with vs, and folowe the interpretation and restriction which we gaue touching Goddes omnipotencie, as appeareth by one speeche of their last wryting, whose wordes be these: All things (say they)

they) that are to be imagined of man, are to be done of God, without excepting any thing, but suche as implie contradiction to be and not to be.

Then what reason is there, that for suche things wherein they cõsent to vs which be excepted frõ Gods almightinesse, that we for excepting them shoulde be guiltie in blasphemie and not the Doctoures, who say and confesse the selfe same thing: This proposition, that a naturall bodie (euen that of Jesus Christe) is in diuers places at one instante, is of the numbre of those things which implie contradiction, as hathe bene already sufficiently proued: therfore we conclude that the omnipotencie of God oughte not to be referred and stretched so farre.

The Doctoures charge vs afterwardes with foure horrible blasphemies as they terme them: grounding them vppon our opinion, defending that one body can not be in diuers places at one instante, as to resiste the truthe, wisdome and omnipotencie of God: this the Doctoures finde so straunge and farre from reason that they disdain to refute it, thinking it is vnworthy of Answere, and that only it suffiseth to recite it: whereunto we Answere that to say it is a blasphemie vnworthy of Answer, is an easie and most ready mean to shake of all difficulties wherwith they may be entangled.

The Doctoures are also importunate with vs, to bring forthe by Goddes worde that one body can not be in diuers places at one instante, whereunto we Answer once againe, that it belongs to the Doctours to proue the contrary by one text of the scripture: that one body may be in one instante in diuers places, seeing they are proponantes, and we respondents in this conference.

And yet we haue declared heere before, by liuely reasons drawne out of the scripture, and essential proprieties of God, the nature of bodies, & the Authoritie of the fathers, that the matter of the question is altogither impossible: and touching their argumẽt containing this nature & form, God cã change the order which he hath established in nature, then he cã also

bring

bring to passe that one bodie, at one time, be in many places: we denie the consequence, and by this reason: suche a case would not only chaunge the order, but also woulde intangle contradiction, which, euen by the Confession of the Doctors, is out of the omnipotencie of God.

In the Article folowing, they doe the same which they reproche in vs, as darkening that, which we clearely proponed in our last writing: by meane whereof, if they will that we Answere them at large, let them vnfolde it better.

Where the Doctors accuse vs to haue malitiously concealed this word, place, in the matter of circumscription of a body measured, we say it was not needeful to vse that word expressly there, bicause there is no man so ignorant, who vnderstanding that a body is circumscripte, inferreth not immediatly that then he is comprehended in a certaine place.

Touching the Camell, if they suffice not with that hathe bene already saide, let him read againe S. Ieromes opinion in his firste Booke againste the Pelagians, who expounding the words of Jesus Christe, saithe as foloweth: in this the Lord hath not saide that which might be done, but hath compared one impossibilitie with an other: for as a Camel cã not enter the hole of a needle, so a rich man shal not enter into the kingdome of heauen: or if thou shewe me that a rich man entreth there, it shall folowe also that a Camell may passe thorowe the hole of a needle: doe not alleage to me Abraham and others whom we reade in the olde Testament to be riche, and being suche, did enter into the kingdome of heauen: bicause, they vsing their riches well, and employing them to good workes, did cease by that meane to be riche: thus it is written in S Ierome: So that, as it is necessary (by his opinion) that for the saluation of the riche man, there be a chaunge in his heart, and that he forbeare to be riche, to the ende to enter into the kingdome of heauen, so there muste be mutation in the Camell, and he to chaunge his proportion to make him passe thorowe the eie of a needle.

Touching the Article folowing, we say, ỹ with gods grace we can discerne the light frõ darknesse, e dreames frõ mater

of

of truth, the same being the occasion that we cannot approue either the argumentes or the conclusions of the Doctours, touching one body to be in many places at one instant: being most assured by good and certaine testimonies of the Scripture, that all that they go about to proue, proceedes not from other where, than of the spirite of errour and lyes: Who by this meanes labours to retayne the impietie and idolatrye, which heretofore he hath established in the world, to the destruction almost of all Christendome.

Touching the Verbe *Dierchestai* the Doctors finde themselues somewhat troubled to saue their penetracion, whych they cannot any way ground vpon the proper signification of that tearme, neither yet vpon any authority of the scripture, as hath bene to them by the places heretofore produced.

To proue that faith comes partlie of our selues, and not wholy of God, the Doctors alledge that no man beleues *nisi volens* (which is that no man beleues but willingly) we answer that (vnder correction of our Maisters) that is to euyll purpose, bicause suche wyll and consent are of God, who workes in the faithfull the wyll and well doyng, the same being very well taught by S. Augustine in one of hys Epistels, where he saith, that when God cals the faithfull to saluation, he findes in them no good wil at al, but that he makes and creates it in their heartes, if he meane to finde it there. That which the Doctors alledge of S. Paule that we worke with God, serues no way to their purpose: For the Apostle speaketh ther of the Minister, not meaning there other thing than that which he writes more clearely to the *Corinthians*, in these wordes: we are Embassadours of Christ, as if God erhorted by vs. And that which they adde, that none of the auncient Doctors haue taught that a body cannot bee in diuers places at one time, we saye they haue: As our former writinges haue proued, as being alledged in the textes of S. Augustine *ad Dardanum*, and in the. 30. treatise of S. Iohn.

We aunswer onely to two pointes of the aduertisement of the Doctors. The first is, that our sermons, our writings, the discipline obserued in our Churches, the censures wee

make of the slaunders there committed, the care we haue to discouer, reprehende, and correct them: the payne we take to reforme what is there disordered, the publike prayers we make in all places to that ende, defende vs towardes all honest men, and iustifie vs agaynst the slaunders of the Doctors. The seconde is, that the Doctors abuse their aduertisement, in saying that Abraham doubted of the promise, the same beyng all together contrarye to the opinion of the Apostle in the fourth to the *Romaines*, where he sayth in proper tearmes, he made no doubt of the promise of God by distrust, but was strengthened by faith, giuing glory to God.

To aunswer the last obiection of the Doctors made (as they say) against our aunswere giuen to their former question vpon the matter of the supper: how soeuer they fayne not to haue delayed the conference and disputation of the Supper and the Masse, yet they are not able to persuade any, of any iudgemēt, that hetherunto they haue not alwaies, and yet do not shift off to enter into it. For what requestes so euer came from the Lady of *Buyllon*, or at any time made by vs, yea, notwithstanding the desire, wyl, & many meanes made by the Duke of *Nyuernois* to drawe them to it, yet they haue stand alwaies vnwylling, yea (and as it were) impossible to enter vpon these two pointes.

The which when wee well perceiued, contayning notwithstanding our desire, not to depart from them, tyll wee had first conferred therein. We often protested not to dispute further with them, if those two articles were not first decided and resolued. To which ende we proponed certaine argumentes, as well of the one as the other, by order and good Methode: to the end they might aduise what they wold oppugne and gaynsay in the sayd argumentes. But the doctors dissimuling herein, in place to pursue thē, propone other friuolous and vnprofitable questions, drawne out of theyr schole diuinitie. And notwithstanding our iust occasion of greefe in that our arguments were omitted by the Doctors, yet to cut of all further pretence or colour to defer, we haue answered their last questions. And now in place to followe

our

our answers & reuerse them, if thei had meane, they propone eftsones other new questiõs, no lesse friuolous than the first, the same reuealing sufficiently their fansies & dissimulation with discouery to euery man, that they disguise their wyl to conferre vpon the sayd pointes, seing they do what they can to alter the conference, to the ende it dissolue afore this matter be cleared. In which respect to conclude and resolue in all the conference, we are determined with Gods grace, to set downe in writing no lesse briefly, than as clearly as we can, all that which God hath taught vs, and we learned by his word, of these matters, as wel to satisfie our duty to God and his honor, & our obedience to the Lorde of *Neuers*, and the Lady of *Buyllon*, as also to content in the end, and edifye the church.

*A conclusion and resolution of the pointes aswell of the supper, as of the Masse, contayning that which the Ministers beleue and teach therof in their churches by the woord of God.*

THe ende & soueraigne felicitie of men is to be knit with God, & dwel in him, for ý it is the onely meane by which their desires may be contented and satisfied, and their harts and mindes fully deliuered from the hard and cruell seruitude of sinne, and al other passions, lustes, feares & distrusts, which oppresse thẽ, the same being the occasion that S. Paule placed perfect blessednesse and euerlasting rest of the happy, in that ý God is in them all things. But bicause mẽ are naturally corrupt and vicious, and of the contrary, God is pure and holy in all perfection, the difficulty is how to chuse the meane, by which they may approche vnto him, seing there is no societie betwene light and darknes, nor any cõmunion betwene iustice and iniquity. This meane cannot be found in them, bicause that of them selues they are altogether inable and incapable to be raysed from the miserie and malediction, whereunto they are falne headlong, in such sorte, as being blynde of vnderstanding, they cannot knowe what is good for them, and muche lesse seeke for it, being frowarde and of hardened heartes. Psal. 7. 5. 2. 8. 1. Cor. 15. 2. Cor. 6.

And therfore it is necessary to forsake and come out of them selues, and searche the meane aforesaid in Jesus Christ, who was giuen vnto them of the father, to be their iustice, wysedome, sanctification, redemption, way, lyfe and truth. Onely there restes now to know, how they may be vnited and conioyned with him. The Apostle teacheth vs it is done by faith, by which Jesus Christ dwelleth in our heartes, and restes in vs, so that he and we are made all one, as he is one wyth his father. There be two principall causes of this fayth, the one is outward, and the other inwarde. The inwarde is the holy spirite, which is called a spirite of faith, bicause he is the author thereof, and hath created and produced it in the hearts of men, inclining and disposing them to receiue in all obedience the worde and promise of God, preached vnto them by the faithfull Executors and Ministers of the same, whiche word is the externall cause of faith. And as this faith increaseth and riseth by degrées, so doth also the vnitie we haue with Jesus Christ, and (by this meane) with God: vntyll as S. Paule saith, that we concurre and mete all together in the vnitie of the faith and knowledge of the sonne of God in perfect man, in the maner of a perfect stature of Christ.

1. Cor. 1. Iohn. 14. Ephe. 3. Iohn. 17. 1. Cor. 4. 13 Rom. 10.

This encrease of faith comes by the operation and vertue of the holy spirite, which was the originall and first author of it. And then after by the continuance of the worde purely preached and pronounced. And lastly by the lawfull vse of the Sacramentes, prouided as seales for the certaintye and confirmation of the fayth, and assurance which we haue of the sayde coniunction with God by Jesus Christ, together with participation of all the benefites, graumtes, giftes, graces, and blessinges, which are purchased for vs by his fauour, as remission of synnes, our regeneration, and mortification of the flesh with his concupiscence. For the better signification of which thinges, and to assure vs of the exhibition and vse of the same, Baptisme was ordayned of God, to the ende that in the water sprinkled vpon our bodies, and in the promise of God added therewith, we may behold (as wyth our eyes) the inuisible grace which God doth to vs, to wash vs,

and

and make vs cleane of our spirituall ordures, and so to sanctifie vs and make vs new creatures: as also to assure vs continuallye of the eternall lyfe, and make vs encrease in the hope we haue by our participatiō of the flesh of Jesus Christ crucified for our redemption, and of his bloud shed for the remission of our synnes: The bread and wyne are distributed to vs in the supper, by the ordinance of Jesus Christ.

But as we acknowledge an vnitie and sacramentall coniunction betwene the exterior signe, and the thing signified by it: so we saye of the other side, that betwene them both there is such a distinction, that the one ought not to be confused with the other: neither the spirituall thing so tyed to the corporall (which representes it) that either the one without the other cannot be receiued, or by necessity they both bee alwayes indeuidablye knyt together: Whereof it followeth that such are in errour who hold that in the supper the bread is transnatured into the substāce of the body of Jesus Christ. And likewise those that say, it is there knit and vnited corporally, so that who soeuer receiues & takes those signes, be he faithfull or infidel, takes and receiues immediately the thing signified by them. Which errour, wyth the moste part of others crept in vpon this matter, hath proceeded, in that men haue not well comprehended what it is to eate the body, and drinke the bloud of Jesus Christ: which ought not to be vnderstand as a maner that corporal meates are taken & eaten, but onely of a spirituall fashion, as is declared in the 1rt of S. Iohn which consistes in that that Jesus Christ dwelles in vs, and we in him, the same being done by the faith we haue in him. As S. Augustine teacheth in his. 25. treatise vpon S. Iohn, saying, why doest thou prepare thy belly and thy teeth? beleue, and thou hast eaten it. Likewise in his third booke of Christian doctrine, chap. 16. as followeth: whē Jesus Christ saith, if you eate not the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his bloud, you shall not haue lyfe in you. It seemes he commaundes to commit a great crime: so that it is a figure, by the which we ought not vnderstand other thing, but that we must communicate with the passion of the Lord, and kepe in

memorie that his flesh was crucified and wounded for vs.

Then the eating of the flesh and body of Jesus Christ is no other thyng than a straight coniunction and vnitie wee haue with hym: which is wrought by the fayth we repose in his promises, euen as by the mutuall promises made and receiued betwene a man and his wyfe, the mariage concludes and is established betwene them, wherein albeit being so knit, they happen by any occasion to be seperate and farre of one from the other touching their bodies, yet are they for all that one flesh and one body by meane of the societie and matrimoniall acquaintaunce betwene them. In like sort, be it that Jesus Christ (with whom we are knyt and vnited by faith and trust we haue in him and in his promises) be, as in respect of his body, resident in heauen, and we remaine here on earth, so that there is a great distance betwene him and vs touching his bodye: yet that doth not hinder vs to be flesh of his flesh, and bones of his bones, and that he is not our head, and we his mẽbers, he our husband, and we his spouse, that we are not of one self body tyed with him, that we are not cloathed of him, and that we dwell not in him, as the braunches in the vine. Neither is there distance of time or place what soeuer it be, nor difference of seasons, which may hinder that coniunction, & that the faithfull eate truly his flesh and blood. For as the auncient Fathers, notwithstandyng they were two or three thousande yeares afore Christ dyed, yet forbare not to communicate in his flesh crucified, and eate the same meate spiritually which we eate, and drinke the same drink spiritually which we drinke: so the faythfull also whiche are comen twelue or fiftene hundreth yeares after, forbeare not, in what place soeuer they be, to participate, as the Fathers, with the same meate and drinke which they did.

Neither is there anye other difference betwene the eating of the Fathers that were before the comming of Jesus Christ, and suche as haue followed hym, but the reason of the more or of the lesse, whiche is, that in the one there is more ample and expresse declaration of Gods good wyll towardes

wardes vs, than in the other. By which we ought to conclude, that from the beginning of the worlde, vntyl the ende, there was neuer, nor euer shall be, other coniunction betweene our Lorde Iesus Christ and his Churche, than spirituall, that is, purchased by the spirite of God. For euen as there is but one fayth in the Fathers, and in vs, which considereth alwayes on the one and other syde our Lorde Iesus Christe: euen so are not wee conioyned with him in other sorte than they were. So that as the Fathers had no other societie or communication then spirituall, euen so it followeth also that we neither are nor can be otherwise vnited with him, than spiritually.

And yet do we not say that we and the Fathers are not flesh of hys flesh, and bones of his bones, & that altogether we participate not as wel with his humanitie, as with his diuinitie. But all our saying and opinion stretcheth to this, that this participation which we haue there, is by the operation and vertue of the holy spirite. Which Iesus Christ in S. Iohn, speaking of this coniunction, teacheth clearelye in these fewe wordes: the thinges whereof I speake to you, are the spirite and life: as also S. Paule, our Fathers (sayth he) haue eaten the same spirituall meate, and dronke the same spirituall drinke. Iohn.6. 1.Cor.10.

Wherein when we speake of thys spirituall eating both in vs and in our Fathers, it must not be thought therefore that we would reiect the holye Supper of the Lord, or once thinke, that in the same the vse of breade and wyne is superfluous: no more then the vse of the water in the Baptisme.

For our Lorde, knowing the hardnesse of our vnderstanding, together wyth the infirmitie and weakenesse of oure hearts, and by a pitie & compassion he hath of vs, seekyng to remedye the same, was not onely content to leaue vnto vs the ministerie of hys word, to assure vs of the participation which we haue in hys flesh and bloud, and all the benefites lykewyse depending thereupon:

But

But he hath also added thereunto the signes of breade and wyne, which he hath annexed to his word as seales to seale in our heartes, by the vse of the same, the fayth which wee haue of the sayd coniunction by his word. Like as it dyd not suffise him to haue contracted the alliance with Abraham by the word and promise he made him, but he added further the signe of Circumcision, as a seale to confirme and assure more amply the sayd alliance.

To the ende then that euery one vnderstande what is the supper of the Lord, and also what we beleue and teach of it, ther must be considered and acknowledged in the same three thinges. First, the ordinaunce of the Lord contayned in hys worde, and declared by his Minister, according to his commaundement. By the which word this holy ceremony was ordained and established in the Churche, to edifie and entertayne the members of the same: which must be diligentlye obserued, as to haue it in such honour and reuerence as appertaineth, and not to put it on the beadroll or sorte of other ceremonies, who haue no other ground or reason of authoritie, than the onely wil and traditions of men: yet there must be heede taken, that by the institution and ordinance, whereof we speake, ther is vnderstanded a certaine pronunciation of words, or any vertue which is hid in them, as do the preests of the Romish church, who by ignorance, and their superstitious opinion thinke to haue consecrated and transubstanciated the bread and wyne which is in their Masse, by the vertue of fiue wordes, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, breathed and pronounced vpon the elementes. Wherein they are no lesse deceiued than abused, bicause the word which is the formall cause of the sacrament is not a word sayd and spoken simply, but a declaration of the institution and ordinaunce of God, don by the Minister, according to his cõmaundement, and a predication of the death of Iesus Christ, wyth the fruite of the same: by the which the heartes of the hearers are raysed into contemplation and meditation of his benefites, and their faith kyndled and enflamed in his loue. And where this is not done, as is sayd, we must not thynke that the elementes

are

are sacramentes, as S. Augustine teacheth vppon S. Iohn. 80. Treatise, in these termes: From whence comes this vertue to the water, that in touching the bodie, it washeth the heart, but that it is done by the worde, not because it is pronounced, but by reason it is beleeued: this worde is the worde of faith which we preache sayeth the Apostle: which is, if we confesse with our mouthe that Christe is the Lord, and beleeue in our heart, that God hath raised him from the deade, we shalbe saued: wherin continuing his matter, he addes in the end these wordes: this worde of faithe which we preache, is the same (without doubt) by which baptisme is consecrated, to the end it may clense and washe.

The ministers inferre heere before two things, the one, that the worde of Consecration is not (as is saide) a simple pronunciation but a publike and manifest declaration of the institution and ordinance with all the misterie of the deathe of Iesus Christe. The other, that the signes and Elementes consecrated, are not chaunged in respecte of their nature and substance, but onely touching the vse and signification, and that only during the Action in which they serue: For, to consecrate the signes (as the water in Baptisme, and the breade and wine in the supper) is no other thing, than to assigne and make them serue to a holy and sacred vse by the publike declaration of the ordinance of God, made to that ende, and not to chaunge them touching their nature and substance: the which vanishing, and being made nothing, there shoulde be no more signe nor (by consequence) any sacrament: So that euen as the water in the Baptisme, after the Consecration, remaines water, without that his nature or substance, be in any thing chaunged or altered: so the bread and wine in the supper, touching their substance, remaine, after the consecration, suche as they were afore, for there should be no Analogie nor correspondencie betweene the signe and the thing signified. For what comparison & conformitie is there betwene the accidents of the bread, and the truthe of the body of Iesus Christe: seeing that the accidents of the breade, as the whitenesse and roundnesse, destitute of their substance (as the Sophisters

phisters doe falsly imagine) coulde not nourishe or sustaine the bodie, and by that meane should not be proper to signifie that the flesh and bloude of Jesus Christe nourishe and sustaine oure soules.

So that we must hold this for resolute, that the bread and wine remaine in their substance: the same being clearely verified by Jesus Christe, who speaking of that which he gaue to his Disciples to drinke in the Supper, calles it spectally the fruite of the Vine: Which can not be referred to the accidentes, but is necessarily to be vnderstanded of the wine in his proper substance: As also by that which S. Paule saythe calling the Elementes of the Supper Breade and Wine, three seuerall times, yea after they were Consecrated: Like as also he wrytes elsewher, we that are many, are one bread and one body, bicause we participate all of one lose: wherein he teacheth vs there by his comparison of the lose, that euen as it is made of many graines, so wrought and mingled togsther, that they can not be distinguished or seperated one from an other, euē so also ought the faithful in the Church, to be so knit and vnited togither in one selfe body, as they may seeme to be members one of another. This comparison wold be altogither foolishe & out of purpose, if the bread which we eate in the supper, were not true bread: Gelasius Bishop of *Rome* wryting against Eutichus, saithe, that the sacramente which we take is a thing Diuine, and yet forbeares not to be a substance and nature of breade and wine: Theodoret also in his first Dialogue, vseth these proper termes, the Lorde hath honored with the name of his bodie and of his bloud the visible signes which representе them: without chaunging their nature, but adding only grace to the nature. The same Author in his second Dialogue, speaking also of the breade and wine distributed in the supper, saythe, that after the sanctification, these mistical signes forsake not their nature, for they remaine in their proper substance, kinde and figure: by meane whereof, they are seene and handled after the Consecration, neither more or lesse then afore. S. Iohn Chrysostome wryting to the Monke Cesarius, saythe: in the Supper we call

Math. 26.

1. Cor. 11.

bread

breade that which is there present, afore it be sanctified: And after the sanctification, by Gods grace and meane of the minister, it hath no more the name of breade, but of the body of our Lord, yet the nature of bread remaines there.

By the places aforesaide, as well of the holy scripture, as Auncient Doctors, and others which might be yet alleaged for this matter, it appeares that the breade and wine in the supper remaine alwayes (as hath bene said) in their proper nature and substance after the Consecration as well as before: wherein it nede not to be doubted that the Faith of the auncient Churche hath not alwayes bene so, and that Transubstantitiaon was neither established nor holde for an Article of Faithe in the Romishe Church until the time of Innocent the thirde.

To withstande and reiecte all that hathe bene sayde touching the nature and substance of the signes which remaine after the Consecration, suche as be aduersaries to this Doctrine, alleage ordinarily the wordes of Jesus Christe, speaking of the breade, in the institution of his supper, take, eate, this is my bodie: And staying vpon the proper and natural signification of the termes, they defend obstinately, that the substance of bread is banished in the Consecration, and that there remaines no other substance, except that of the bodie of Jesus Christe.

The reason of this, is, that they obserue not the Figures and manner of speeches, which are ordinarily vsed in the holy Scripture, when and as often as there is Question of the matter of the sacramentes: For then the name of the things signified is ordinarily attributed to the signes which represent and signifie them: as the name of the alliance is attributed to the Circumcision, bicause it was alligned to signifie and ratifie it. The Lambe, by like reason is called the passage: and Baptisme, washing of regeneration, and that not bicause they be things like to the signes and mysteries signified by them: But for the conformitie that is betweene them: The signes (as S. Augustine him selfe doth say) take oftentymes the name of the things which they represent:

Gene. 17. Exod. 12. Tit. 3. Epist. 23

so that the erroꝛ proceedes in that they take and vnderstand the manners of speeches figured, as if they were proꝑs and naturall.

That this speeche, take and eate, this my body, is figuratiue: it appeares by that which our Lord Jesus Christe addes after of the cuppe, saying: this cuppe is the newe Testament in my bloud, which is shed foꝛ you: Where he calles the cuppe Testament, and new aliance in his bloude: wherin we must necessarily confesse that there is figure, and that without it the saide place could not be wel vnderstand, noꝛ aptly interpreted. Foꝛ it is a thing manifest, that an aliance (which is a contrary couenant betweene parties made and cõcluded vnder a certaine promisse and woꝛde:) is not the wine, and yet it is so called by figure: bicause the wine which is distributed in the supper, is as the seale, by the which the saide aliance is sealed, and the faithe of the same confirmed: By suche oꝛ like manner, must we also vnderstand and expoũd this sentence: this is my body: the same being as much to say, as, this is the newe Testament in my bodie, which is deliuered foꝛ you: Foꝛ, as by the effusion of his blud, the new Testament was ratified, so was it also by the death of his body: we nede not searche better interpretation of the woꝛds of Jesus Christe, than Jesus Christe himselfe. Foꝛ it is certaine, that that which he saide of the cuppe, is as a glose, and cleare and familiare exposition of that which he sayd of the breade moꝛe briefly and darkely, which is also proued by S. Paule: The breade which we breake (saithe he) is not the Communion of the body of Christe, which is a manner of figuratiue speeche, bicause that to speake and vnderstãd properly, the bread which is a coꝛporall and materiall thing, is not the Communion which we haue in the body of Jesus Christe, which is a thing spiritual and inuisible, and yet it is so called, as being a signe thereof, to repꝛesent it to vs, and assure vs of it: euen as we call commonly the letter signed and sealed, which containes the declaration of the last will of a man, his Testament, albeit it is not his testamẽt, which is properly the declaration which he hath made verballie of his said will, but it is so called

1. Corrin.

led because it is the instrument and testimonie thereof.

And euen as the Scripture and the Auncients, as well to recommende and raise the dignitie of the signes, and cutte of by that meane the mistaking of them, as also for the conformitie and likenesse that is betweene the signes & the things signified, haue attributed sometimes, the names of the same things signified to the signes which they represent, and speaking of the signes, haue vsed figuratiue speeche: So they haue spoken of them sundry other times properly, to take away all occasion of abuse, and preuent, that in taking without distinction the signes of the thing signified by them, there shuld be attributed to them the effectes which appertaine not but to the matters only which they signifie: of these two sundry reasons and manner of speeche, there be examples as well in the scriptures, as in the Auncient fathers. Of the firste, we haue an example in the Circumcision, when it is called by figure, aliance, Gene. 17. vers. 13. And of the seconde, there is also an example in the same Chapter, vers. 11. where the Circumcision is properly called signe of the aliance, in Exo. 12. ver. 11. there is also an other example of the firste manner of figuratiue speeche, where the Lambe is called the Passeouer of the Lorde: and touching the seconde man, which is proper, an example also in the same place, vers. 3. where the bloude of the Lambe is called a signe. In like manner and order, when is mention in the scriptures of the supper, the wordes run sometimes of the bread by figure, as when it is called the bodye of Iesus Christe, or the Communion of the body, as hathe bene said before: and sometimes also it is spoken of properly: as when it is saide, who so euer shall eate of this breade: also euery one then proues himselfe, and eates so of this breade: 1. Cor. 1.

Like diuersitie in bothe the manners of speeche is founde oftentimes in the Auncient fathers touching the matter of the supper: For sometimes they speake of the bread by figure, calling it the body of Iesus Christe: as S. Cyprian when he sayeth, the body of the Lorde is taken with foule handes, and his bloude dronke with a prophane and defiled mouthe: and in an other place, that we sucke his bloude, and fasten oure In a Sermon of the supper.

tongs in the woundes of our Redeemer. Likewise S. Ierome when he saithe that Exuperius Bishop of *Tholoze* caryed the bodie of our Lorde in a little pannier of Willowes, and his blonde in a glasse. S. Chrysostome also, when he wrytes, that Iesus suffreth himselfe not onely to be seene, but also to be touched and eaten, and that teethe are fixed in his fleshe, and touched with tong. Lastly S. Augustine: With what care do we take heede, when the bodie of Iesus Christe is administred to vs, that nothing of the same fall from our handes to the earthe.

All which sentences, with their likes, are figuratiue wherein is no doubt, that in the right and directe interpretation of them, ought not to be taught to the readers, but that in them the name of the thing signified, is applied to the signes which signifie it: which may be easily gathered of other sentences and textes of the saide Auncients; where speaking properly of the breade and wine which are distributed in the supper, they cal them signes and figures. As Tertullian, Iesus Christ (saithe he) toke breade and distributed it to his Disciples, and makes it his body, when he saith, this is my body, which is to say, a figure of my body: And Cyprian, by the wine shewes the blonde of Christe: Also in a Sermone which he made of the supper of oure Lorde: As often as we do this, we whette not our teethe to bite, but breake and distribute the holy breade in true Faithe, by the which we distinguishe the matter diuine and humaine: Also in a Sermon he made *De Christmate*, the Lord gaue with his proper handes, bread and wine in the Table, wherein he perfourmed his laste repaste with his Disciples: but on the Crosse, he deliuered into the hands of the armed men his body to be wounded, to the ende he might impaint so muche the more deepely the truthe into his disciples, and they to declare to the people howe the bread and wine were his body and blonde, and howe the sacrament agreed with the thing for the which it was instituted: and also howe one sacrament is made of two things, and therefore is named with two names, and one selfe name is giuen to that which signifieth, and to that which is signified. S. Basile

propones

propones to vs figures and patrones of the sacred bodie and bloud of Iesus Christe: And likewise S. Augustine, the Lord had no horor to say, this is my body, when he gaue the signe of his body.

The Lord receiued Iudas to his supper, wherin he recommended and gaue to his Disciples the figure of his bodie: S. Ierome, After he had eaten the Paschall Lambe with his disciples, he toke bread to strengthen the hart of man, and past to the true sacrament of the passage, to the end that as *Melchisedech* had done before in his figure, he might also there represent his true bodie: S. Ambrose, this sacrifice is a figure of the body and bloud of our Lord Iesus Christe: Chrysostome, he hath dressed this Table, to the ende he may shew vs daily the bread and wine in mysterie and similitude of the body and bloude of Christ. And it happeneth sometimes, that a Doctor in this matter expoundes the other: as may be perceiued in the conference of the two places, the one of S. Augustine alreadie alleaged, and the other of Tertullian in the Booke of the crowning of a knighte: where he sayth, we hardly suffer, that any thing of oure bread and wine fall on the earthe. In place of that which S. Augustine to the same matter sayth, (as hathe bene recited here before) we take diligent hede that nothing of the body of oure Lorde fall on the earthe.

And euen as in diuers places, the Auncientes (as hathe bene declared) haue vsed the two manners of speche aforesaide, speaking of the supper sometimes by figure, somtimes simply and properly: so it is oftentimes founde, that in one selfe place, the two manners of speche haue bene vsurped in their writings: as in a Canon of the Counsel of *Nice*, wher is saide, it hathe bene thus concluded of the Table of the Lorde, and of the mysterie vppon the same, meaning of the worthie bodie and bloude of Iesus Christe. At the Table of the Lorde, we ought not to reuerence basely vppon the bread and wine there sette oute, but to raise our hartes on highe by Faithe, with persuasion, that vppon the holy Table is exhibited the Lambe of God which takes vpon him the sinnes of

the

the worlde, which is sacrificed of the Priestes, and not kil'ed: And communicating truely with his bodie & precious bloud, we oughte to beleeue that those things are signes of our Resurrection. By which may be seene howe in one place, the fathers haue spoken properly, calling breade and wine the signes and elementes which are presented in the supper, and by figure also naming the same signes the Lambe of God which takes vpon him the sinnes of the worlde.

Suche therefore as reade the scriptures and Auncient Fathers, are warned by the discourse of the two manners of speeche aforesaide, to vse diligent heede, that for not distinguishing the places where the saide speeches are vsurped, they confounde them not, taking that which oughte to be vnderstande by figure, as if it were properly spoken, and proper speeche, as if it were vnderstande by Figure: wherein must be alwayes remembred in the reading of the scripture, as also the Auncientes, the opinion of S. Augustine in his Bookes of Christian Doctrine: We muste beware (saythe he) that we take not a Figuratiue speeche for the letter: whereunto may be referred the saying of the Apostle, the letter killeth and the spirite reuiues: So that to vnderstande that which is sayde by figure, as if it were spoken properly, is a fleshly wisdome.

Vppon the ende of the Chapter, he remembreth one worthy sentence, that it is a miserable seruitude of the soule to take the signes for the thing signified, and not to be able to raise the eye of the spirite aboue the corporall creature, to drawe the eternall lighte.

To come to the thirde parte of the supper, being the spirituall and celestiall thing which is there representes and exhibited vnto vs, as well in the elements, as in the action, we say, that it is Jesus Christe crucified & offred on the Crosse to God his father, for the expiation & perfect satisfaction of all ỹ sinnes of the worlde: And to make vs enioy the fruite of this sacrifice, and to applie to vs iustice, remission of sinnes, life, grace of God, with all the other fauors and blessings, which by the same sacrifice haue bene purchased & obtained for vs:

the

The word and the Sacramentes haue bene left and ordayned for vs, and specially that of the Supper, wherin as vpon a table we behold Iesus Christ suffering for vs all the dollours and anguishes of death, paying our debts, and cancelling the bonde that was against vs, carying vppon him selfe our malediction, to discharge vs of it, and by his obedience reconciling vs to God his father, and appeasing his wrath towardes vs. All which thinges are representeed and assured to vs in the Supper, when with a true fayth we come thither to celebrate it. Then the Supper was not ordayned to be a sacrifice propiciatorie (as the Doctors teache, and the Romish churche falsly beleueth) but to be a Sacrament, to kepe fresh, and preserue alwayes the memorie which we ought to hold constantlye of the death and sacrifice of Iesus Christ. There is great difference betwene sacrament and sacrifice, bicause in sacrifice we present to God our oblatiõs, and in the sacrament, God (of the contrarie) doth offer and communicate with vs hys graces and giftes. Also in the sacrifice for synne, there is death and effusion of bloude of the host and oblation, and not in the sacrament, but onely the application of the fruites and effectes of the sacrifice. So that in the Supper Iesus Christ is not eftsoones sacrificed, but the fruites of his obedience, and of the merite of hys sacrifice are there distributed and receiued by the faythfull.

By the reasons aforesayde we conclude, that it is a blasphemie and sacriledge, to call the bread of the Masse of a romish Priest, an host saluatorie. And if to proue it the auncientes be alledged, in whose writinges it is found, that sometime the Supper was called oblation and sacrifice: we answer, that first, that belonges nothyng to the Masse of the Priestes, betwene the which and the Supper there is no affinitie. And then, that which the auncientes haue sayde, that they neuer vnderstode it a Sacrifice propiciatorie, by the which remission of synnes is gotten and obtayned. Neither haue they beleued or thought, that there was an other sacrifice to appease Gods wrath, and purchase a reconcilement betwene him & men, than the onely sacrifice of Iesus Christ

made by him, onely once vpon the crosse. We say then in effect three thinges: first that there neither is nor can be other sacrificator of the newe Testament than Jesus Christ. The reasons are, because there is none but he of whom it hath bene said, thou art priest eternally, according to the order of Melchisedeck. Also ther is none but he to whom may be applyed the conditions and essentiall qualities of the sacrificator, and of the sacrificature: which be that the sacrificator be holy, innocent, without spot, seperated from sinners, exalted aboue the heauens, who hath not neede euery day to offer sacrifices, first for his own sinnes, and then for the sins of the people. Also there is none but he, which either is, or may be mediator betweene God and men, that is able to satisfie the deuine iustice, capable to beare & endure the wrath of God, that can tame and ouercome death, that by his death and proper bloude is able to procure the ratification of the new testament, and who lastly is able in fauour and contemplation of hys merites and dignities, to obtayne of God the remission of synne, with other graces which are necessarie to such as seeke him and trust in him.

Secondly, we saye there is no other sacrifice for synne, but that of Jesus Christe, who is the onelye Lambe that beares the synne of the world, that there is but his bloud, by the which our abominations are washed & made cleane. To be short, that God takes no pleasure in other sacrifice or oblation, and that he requires no other Holocaustes nor offering for synne, and that for this reason, Jesus Christ (as is written of him in the roule of the law) is come to do and accomplish the wyll of God his father.

Thirdly we say of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that it is onely, and once offered by him selfe, without neede euer after to repeate or reitterate it, considering his perfection and vertue, by the which synne is abolished, and perfect and eternall sanctification obtained to all the chosē, as appeareth in the. 9 & .10. to the *Hebrues*. By meane wherof it is no lesse blaspheme, & matter contrary to the doctrine and meaning of the Apostle, to approue the repetition and reitteration of the

sacri-

sacrifice of Jesus Christ, than the plurality of sacrifices sey sin. And if the Doctors would (as hath bene their custome) to disguise and colour such an abuse, preferre their distinction betwene the sacrifice propiciatory, and applicatorie, as to say the Prestes pretende not in their Masses to sacrifice Jesus Christ for other ende than to apply the merite of hys death to those by whom they celebrate them: We answer, that in doyng thus, they would attribute more than they do to Jesus Christ, bicause all the fruite of hys sacrifice comes to vs by the application of the same, euen as the healing our cure comes not so much of the confection and preparation of the medecine, as by applying the same. Besides we make this question to our Maisters, by what meanes the benefit of the death of Jesus Christ was applyed to the fathers afore his cõming, seeing at that time ther was no Masse song. All men of any spirit & iudgemẽt may perceiue that those distinctions are friuolous, & suborned onely to darken the truth, & bleare the eyes of the simple and ignorãt. For Jesus Christ who hath offered the sacrifice, is the selfe same which he applies to vs by his spirite, his word, and his sacramentes.

And now to returne to the matter of our beginning, & to declare to what ende the auncients haue called the Supper & all the action of the same sacrifice: there is to be noted that in the supper ther be many sortes of sacrifices, as the sacrifice of a contrite hart, which is offred by publik confession of sins done there. After, the sacrifice of our bodies, which is there offred by open praier following the said confession: thirdly, the sacrifice of praise and thanks giuing, there offered, when after the confession & prayers they sing Psalmes. The preaching of the gospel (which is called a sacrifice *Rom. 15.*) comes after, as when the confession & praiers being done, the Minister presents himselfe to the people, to reueale the worde of God. Almes (which is an other kinde of sacrifice) were in times past layd to the supper by the faythfull: who by thys meane would testifie not onely the memorie they had of the graces and benefits of God, but also their charity and desire they had to relieue the necessities of their poore neighbours.

Ouer and besides all these kindes of sacrifices, there be two particular in the Supper, whereof is mention made in the writinges of the auncientes, the breade and wine which were chosen and taken of the almes brought thether for the poore: and were consecrated, that is to say, assigned and deputed to the holy & sacred vse of the supper. The other kinde is the memorie of the death and sacrifice of Iesus Christ celebrated and repeated in all the action of the Supper, which for this reason is called sacrifice by S. Iohn Chrisostome vpon the Epistle to the *Hebrues*, his wordes be these: We do euery day no other sacrifice, than that of Iesus Christ, no rather saith he (in correcting him selfe) we make the memorie of the same sacrifice. S. Ambrose cals it the memorie of our redemption, to the ende that we remembring our Redæmer, may obtaine of him to multiply his graces vpon vs. S. Augustine propones it also more cleare, vnder a comparison of the daies of the passion & resurrection of Iesus Christ, which he applies in this maner: Often times whē the feast of Easter approcheth, we vse this maner of speaking, to morow, or within two daies we haue the passion or the resurrection of Iesus Christ. It cannot be properly vnderstand of the daye that Christ suffered death, (which is past long since) but onely of the memory of his death, the which is solemnised and celebrated as vpon that day, euery yeare. A litle after he addeth to appropriate his comparison, hath not Iesus Christe beue offered in himselfe one onely time: and yet in the Sacrament of the Supper, not onely the day of Easter, but euery day he is offered to the people.

Chap. 16. Hom. 17.

Epist. 29.

In an other place: the flesh and bloud of this sacrifice afore the comming of Iesus Christ were promised by the figures of sacrifices: in the passion of Iesus Christ they were deliuered vp and offered in truth. And since Iesus Christ ascended into heauen, they are celebrated by the sacrament of memorie. By these places and many other like, we maye deduce that the fathers haue often called the supper sacrifice, bicause in it the memory of the sacrifice of Iesus Christ is restored and celebrated.

Agaynst Faustine.

The

The name of sacrifice is also often times applyed by the auncientes to the almes brought by the faithfull in the supper, as by Iustine Martyr in the second Apologie, by S. Augustine in his.20.boke, chap.20.against Faustus, by S. Ciprian in his boke of the almes, by S. Chrisostome, hom.46. upon S. Mathew. which may also be verified euen by the canon of the Masse, where it is sayd, we offer to thy maiestie part of thy giftes and benefites, the same to be referred to the almes of the faithfull, offered by the Minister to God, in the name of all the church. Sometimes the prayers which were made there, were called sacrifices, as Cyprian upon the dominicall prayer, and Eusebius in the.vj. of the Ecclesiasticall history, Tertullian in the third boke against Marcion, where alledging the place of Malachie of the cleane offring which ought to be made to God from the sunne rising, tyll the setting of the same, saith, it ought to be understand of the Hymnes and prayses to God, which S. Ierome also confirmes in hys exposition upon the sayd place.

For conclusion of this matter, we say, that all the places of the bookes of the auncientes, wherein touching the matter of the supper, is mencion made of the sacrifice, ought to be referred to one of the sayd kindes: neither can it be found, that either they haue sayd, written, or thought, that there was other sacrifice propiciatorie, than onelye that whiche Iesus Christ hath once offered on the crosse in his proper body for our redemption: by which meane it is sure that he ought to be acknowledged in the Christian church sacrificator of the new testament. And touching the other sacrifices, as that of a contrite hart, mortification of the flesh, of thankes geuyng and almes, and the pronouncement and memory of the death of Iesus Christ: we saye that generallye it belonges to the church to offer them, and that there is neither faithfull, nor any member in all the body of the Church, who for this respect is not sacrificature: as S. Peter saith in his first Epistle, chap.2. and S. Iohn in the *Apocalips*, chap.1. and that for that reason we ought to offer in the Supper such sacrifices vnto God, as appeares euen by the canon of their Masse, by them

euill vnderstanded & applied to the sacrifice which they pretend of the body and blod of Jesus Christ, where it is sayd, for the which we offer thee, or who offer thee. &c.

That which we say of the sacrificature, that it is common to al the church to offer to God sacrifice of thankes giuyng, ought not to be slaũderously interpreted, as though we wold confuse the ecclesiastical ministery, wyth the sayd sacrificature, and by that meane reuerse and trouble the order of the church, giuing to euery one an autority & power to gouerne it. For we know well inough that vocations are different amongst the people of God, and that it is necessarye, that in the church ther be Pastors & Doctors, with other Ministers (as Deacons and Auncients) to guide it well and edifie, as well by continual preaching of the word, as carefull execution of other thinges concerning their charges: onelye we must distinguish those vocations which are particular, from the sacrificature aforelaid, which ought to be generall and common (as is sayd) to all the Church.

Such now, as with diligence will obserue the matters here before discoursed & proued by Gods word, may easely see & iudge, that the Masse as it is celebrate at this day in the Romish church, is ỹ whole corruption & reuersement of the institution of the supper which Jesus Christ hath established and left in his church, so that at this daye it is impossible to finde or discerne one onely mark of his first ordinance. For of a sacrament which Jesus Christ left in his church to reuy and entertain it in a present memory of his death, they haue made a sacrifice, by the which the remembrance of the same Jesus Christ is altogether buried & defaced. Wherin there is this thing specially maruelous, and no lesse worthy to be wel noted, that ỹ which appertained not but to the sonne of God, & impossible to any to do but to himselfe, as to sacrifice for synne, to reconcile men vnto God, to appease his wrath towards them, & to intercesse for fauour and helpe of them, the Priests attribute to themselues. And ỹ which is lawfull & cõmaunded, yea & possible for them to do, as to solemnise the memory of Jesus Christ, & in taking, breaking, distribu-

ting,

ting and eating the bread, and drinking the wine, to declare his death, they haue altogether left. So that as we may say that whatsoeuer Christ did in the supper, and commaunded to do, the Priestes do nothing at all, euen so, what he did on the crosse, and commaunded man neuer to do it, the Priests vndertake and seeke to do it.

The errors and abuses aswel of transubstanciation, as of sacrificature, and sacrifice expiatory, and the repetition of the same, which be the principall partes, and (as it were) the grounds of the Masse, haue bene heretofore confuted, and sufficiently ouerthrown, as wel by Gods word, as other reasons here alledged in the declaratiō of the parts of ỹ supper. And now ther restes no more to batter wholy this Idol, but to shew that the residue of the Masse is no better stuffe, nor better grounded in Gods word. For the adoration which is there done to the bread and wine is an idolatry condemned and cursed of God. And it is not likely to be true, that Iesus Christ instituting the supper, had not ordained it, & S. Paule reciting this as he had receiued it of the Lord, had not taught it, and that the auncient church had omitted it, if it had bene a thing wherin God might haue bene any way honored.

Besides, the seperation of the Priest from the people, is directly contrary to the article of faith of the Communion of the church, and contrary to the purpose & end for the which the supper was ordained: the same tending to confirme and entertaine the societie that ought to be betwene the faythfull, and bynde them alwayes more strayghtly one to another. So that as it cannot be more rightly tearmed than a presumption intollerable, and a manyfest disdayne of the rest of Gods people: So that whiche the Doctors haue alledged to excuse and couer such a sacriledge, is no lesse vaine and frualous, which is, that the Masse of the Priestes doth not forbeare to be good, notwithstanding the assistants wyl not communicate ther. For first, they are forbidden to eate alone in the supper, and there is no supper where is no communion, as S. Paule teacheth, rebuking the *Corinthians*, for departing one frō an other in the celebration of their supper.

When

When (saith he) you assemble your selues together, it is not to eate the supper of the Lord, seeing whē ye come to eating,
1. Cor. 11. euery one aduaunceth to take it particularlye. Therefore, vpon the end of the chapter, teaching them what forme to vse therein, he sayth: therefore (my brethren) when you assemble to eate, tary one for an other. Besides, it happeneth often times that in their Masse, there is none but the Priest, and a litle Clarke to aunswer him, whom they wyll not take to communicate with them.

Also, howe can they excuse the Masses which are song in Monasteries, wher the people are defended to communicate with the Monkes that celebrate them? yea, it is ordinarelye seene in great parishes, in *Paris* and elswhere, that when the people communicate, they are seperate from the Prests, who doing their businesse a part, disdayne to eate and cōmunicate at one table with them. And what cōmunion is there betwene the Priestes and the people, seeing that in place to breake in the assemblye, one selfe loafe (to the ende that all participating therein, shoulde by that meane be the more straightly conioyned and knyt in one selfe body) euerye one hath his owne a part: the Priest a greater, and the people one somewhat lesse: Seeing also the Chalice is in no sort distributed. Furthermore, what indeuor is vsed by the prests to inuite and exhorte the people to communicate wyth them, yea euen the Bishops, who at this day hold it as a matter of shame to communicate with Artisans, and other people of meane condition.

For conclusion, if the Doctors had well considered the customes of the auncients, who caused to go out of ẏ place, wher the Communion was done, the *Catachumeni*, and others not prepared to communicate: And likewise if they had remembred the doctrine of S. Iohn Chrisostome, shame would haue forbid them to defend such an abuse and impietie, as is that
Sermo. 3. ad Ephes. of their Masse. Wherin to the ende the people shal not rest ignorant in the opinion of that holy Doctor, we wyl here deuide it word by word: It is in vayne that the dayly oblatiō is done, it is in vayne that we remayne at the aulter, ther is

no body

no body that Communicates there: I say not this to the ende you Communicate in any fashion, but to the ende you make your selues worthy of it. Arte thou not worthy to Communicate? no more art thou to pray. A little after he sayth further: if any were called to a banket, and washed his handes, and being set at the table, did not eate nor taste any thing of the meates there serued, should he not doe dishonor & wrong to him that inuited him: had it not bene better for him not to haue come thither, euen thus is it of thee: For thou art come, thou hast song Psalmes with the rest of the people, thou hast confessed thy selfe to be of the number of the worthy, and not departing from those that are vnworthy: how then dost thou tary, and not participate at the table of the Lord: thou sayst, I am vnworthy, I answere thee, that euen so arte thou also, touching the Communion of Prayers.

Thirdly, the gobbins and tronshons of the Gospels and Pistles, the Creede, Prayer, and other peces referred to the scripture, altogither confused and shaken of, pronounced to the people in a tong not vnderstand (contrary to the expresse commaundemente of God, and without any edifying of the multitude) is no other thing than a vaine vsurpation of the name of God, against the expresse defence made by the same: which ornaments are to narow and short to couer the shame and horror of the Masse.

Fourthly, what execrable abuse is it to say, that the Masse serues not only to the liuing, but also for the dead, to obtaine remission of their sinnes: wherin the priestes forgetting neither shame nor blasphemie, deuide their osse into three parts, with this visor vppon it, that one is for them that be in heauen, an other for suche as liue on earth, and the thirde serues for the soules that abide in purgatorie. But the Sacrament, which is not ordained but to confirme the faith of the word, stretcheth no further then the ministerie, and the ministerie no longer than this life: so that if it be so that those that are in heuen, & such like wise as are fained to be in purgatorie be dead and departed this world: we must necessarily conclude that as Gods worde can not be preached vnto them, so also

they cannot partake in the administration of the sacraments, and if they be not administred to them, they can nothing profite them.

The ende of the Resolution.

*An Answer to the last Obiections proponed by the Doctours touching the Supper.*

WE say, that there be many things in the sayde Obiections, impertinente to the matter of the Question, as where they demaund, how many woyldes the Doctrine hath remained pure, bothe touching the supper, and other articles of religion: whereunto we Answer, that euen in the time of the Apostles, there were heretikes and Antichristes, as Ebion Cerinthus, Simon Magicien, the Samaritanes and others, who, by their errors and heresies went aboute to shake euen the Apostolical Churches, and corrupte the pure Doctrine of the same, whome the Apostles resisted valiantly in all possible sorte, reuoking and referring alwayes all things to their former institution, and foundations of the pure word of God: as we see S. Paule did on the behalfe of the Corinthians and Galathians, whose Churches albeit he had most well planted and licoured, yet they were corrupted in his life time both in manners and doctrine: And where the Doctors aske, howe long time, the puritie of the doctrine and Religion hath perseuered in the Churche of God after the decease of the Apostles, as wel touching the Article of the supper, as for others: we Answere that the continuance hath bene, euen so long time, as Gods worde hath bene folowed and preached.

Touching the Obiection of the Doctors folowing, blasing the supper celebrated in the Reformed churches, as that we shoulde abuse the Communicantes, by giuing them no other thing than a nothing betweene two platters: we Answere, that that blase doth more aptly become them than vs, bicause they offer to suche as they summone to their Masses, but the Accidents, indiuidible waues, and only the sighte of formes of breade and wine, to feede them withall.

A litle after, they call the sacrifice of their Masse, most pre-

tious,

pretious: wherin we cõuiscend with them, and say, they haue reason so to exalt it with a noble and most precious title, bicause of the greate reuenues and riches which this pretious sacrifice brings them: which we may say hath bene to them a fleece or mine of Golde more riche and plentifull, than euer was that of Iason, or all the mines of the Caste: as hauing brought the world to beleeue, (and spetially the founders of Abbaies, Priories, and other benefices) that their sacrifices were auaileable, for the redemption, remedie and releefe of their soules.

Afterwards, the Doctors, without all shame call the supper of the Lord, detestable, bicause (as they say) we offer nothing there but common bread and wine: wherunto we Answer, that in our supper, we offer in deede bread and wine to the people, which after the consecration remain in their substance, as before: but we denie, that, for al that, the said bread and wine are common, bicause (as hath bene hertofore amplie declared to the Doctors) that both the one and the other by the preaching and pronoũcing of the ordinance of God is changed, as is said in respecte of the vse, but not touching the nature: wher ẏ doctors offer to charge vs with monopolies, contributions, conspiracies & secrete practises against ẏ state of our Prince, vnder colour & pretence of our supper: we Answer, that that is not to impugne our doctrine, but impudently to despite & slander vs, for such hath ben the faith of the reformed religion, as bisides ẏ it hath ben proued, with ẏ losse of their bloud & life, yet the king in his councel & by his edict, hath declared vs his most faithful & well affected subiects: but it is not to be maruelled, if the doctors heape these slaunders vpon the reformed churches, seeing in al times, the Christiãs haue bene accused of such crimes by the enimies to the truth: As appeareth by the Apologetike of Tertullian and S. Augustines Bookes of the Citie of God: By the Treatise of S. Cyprian againste Demetrius, and by the Booke of Arnobius, which he wrote againste the Gentiles. Onely we maruell howe the Doctoures are so euill aduised, as to alleage the Suppers in the Reformed Churches, to verifie their accu-

accusatiõs, seeing that as they are at this day publikely done euery where, in the view and presence of so many as wil beholde them, so there is nothing hid, nor so hard, as euery one (if he wil) may not easily be informed: only it is the zeale & great charitie of our maisters the Doctors, (wherein hereto-fore they haue protested euen by the Inuocation of the name of God) that caries them without shame or likelihode, thus to slaunder vs, whose iustice in this case is to Answere for vs bothe afore God and men.

And to proue and confirme their poynts afore recited, the Doctors adde, that it appertaines not to all men indifferently to Consecrate the matter of the sacramentes, but to suche only as are ordained by imposition of the Romishe Bishops hands: wherunto we Aunswer, and confesse the first poynte, as hauing saide in other places, that the vocation is necessary to suche effecte: But not that this vocation is the imposition which they pretend, assuring our selues, that our vocation is more lawfull and better grounded, than that of the Doctors.

Where the Doctors, in the Article folowing, alleage that we haue not Answered them to their sufficient liking, touching the partes of the sacrament, and the word required for the consecration of the matter in the same: we Aunswer, that in our writyngs, is no ambiguitie, no darke sense, nor any inuolution, but suche as the Doctors list to finde there: wherin as we lay our selues vppon the iudgement of the vpright hearers. So, also it becomes no more straunge to vs that the doctors chalenge vs of darke writing, than it was to S. Paul, that his gospell was hid and couered to those that perished, & whose vnderstandings the God of this world had blinded.

Touching the presence of Iesus Christe in the supper, wherin they would vrge vs to declare more amplie, than in our former Aunswer, we say, we haue Aunswered sufficient clearly: notwithstanding the doctors rest not satisfied, wherof we make no greate maruell, as knowing that they haue seldome in custome to be contented, onlesse we consent both to their demaundes and desires, which we are not nowe setled to do, and much lesse that our Aunswer exceede the limits

and

and bounds of the scripture, neither in this Article of the supper, nor in others: but onely to folow the phrases and manners of speeche of the same as neere as we can possibly: By meane wherof, for a full and resolute Aunswer, we acknowledge no other eating of the flesh and bloud of Jesus Christe, whether in or out of the supper, than that which Jesus Christ declares in the sixth Chapter of S. Iohn, who eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloud, he hath life euerlasting: also, he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my bloude, he dwelles in me and I in him: as the liuing Father hath sent me, so I goe thither bicause of my father, and he that shall eate me, shall liue also bicause of me.

Uppon the last Article which is of the concomitance, we Aunswer that the Doctors demaunde was not so harde, that we conceiued it not: only we dissembled it, as not to lose time to speake and write of such dreames: wherin also we indged the Doctors of sufficient suttletie to vnderstande, that in denying them Transubstantiation, was not to approue their concomitance. And nowe to satisfie them we make this addition, not to seke to know more, than that which Jesus Christ teacheth in his word, that in the supper, to participate in his flesh crucified, and blud shed for remission of sinnes, we must take and eat the bread, and drinke the wine which are administred, and not deuide or separate them in any sort, the same being also defended by the Canons, De consecr. dist. 2. Cum omne crimen.

*Wednesday the fourteenth of August the yeare aforesaide.*

This writing being dispatched and sent away, the Ministers not long after, went to the Lord of *Neuers*, with declaration that for their parts, they had at large handled this cõference, as finding the doctors by their impertinent and vain questions hitherto to seke only to winne time, without any aduauncement at al of the solution of the supper & the Masse: And albeit they disguised their demaundes as necessarily to tend to a preparatiue for this disputation, yet they contained

no other purpose, than not at all to enter the conference, but rather to keepe things in suspence vntil they grew weary, by which meanes this holy purpose might altogither dissolue & breake: in the ende, they beseeched him humbly to aduise the Doctors (without vaine varietie or change of matter) to auoide the difference, and refute that which the Ministers had maintained of the supper, and defend that which they had condemned of the Masse: wherein they obtained his promisse which gaue them a hope of profitable matter hereafter, and such as might serue to edifie the readers, and purge the greatest abuse and error that then occupied the Romishe Church.

All this notwithstanding, there ran immediately a bruite throw ȳ towne that Vigor was falne into a dangerous sicknesse, without likelihode of speedy recouery, the same giuing a feare to the Ministers to be intercepted in their laste hope: which they doubted so muche the more, as at the instant they were told that Doctor Saincles, was also gone out of *Paris* to the Cardinal of *Lorraine*, by which they could not otherwayes presume, than that they should be enforced to a long abode in *Paris*, without any sette exercise to occupie the time, as being come thither but by chance: for Spyna but made it in his way to passe into *Anjou*, and for the other, being Minister to the Church of *Orleans*, it was not long since he was taken out of prison, whether he was led in June afore, vpon a false imputation by the enimies of Gods Churche, charging him to be Author of a most pernitious & wicked Boke written against the obedience to Kings and Princes, by which he founde it very inconuenient for him to tarie so long in the Towne, whether he came not at the first willingly.

For these respects they resolued eftsones to returne to the Lord of *Neuers*, and also to tel him that seeing doctor Saincles (who might haue tarried and drawne to him in Vigors place some other at his pleasure) was departed without any aduertisement of his returne: there was also no reason of their abode stil, as wel in respect of ȳ incertaintie of their businesse, as also ȳ their Churches had neede of them for the exercise of their charge as they desired: notwithstãding, in the end, they

yelded

yelded to their proper incommoditie, as to remaine there vntil the Lord of *Neuers* parted from *Paris*, which shuld be vpon the ende of August, being minded then to go to a Lordship of his called *Conlomiers*, for then, hauing neither the presence of the Lord of *Neuers*, nor the company of the Doctors, the Ministers were at a gaze, as hauing nothing to doe, nor any man to dispute withall.

Vpon these declarations, the Lorde of *Neuers* deliuered them their passport in writing, signed, *Lodonico de Gonzague* with promisse to send vnto them the Answer of the Doctors, & that by the meane of the Lord *de Buci S. Georg*, who vndertoke the charge of ý businesse: The Ministers for their parts promised also to be ready to returne to *Paris*, either els to Answer from the place where they should remaine, as often as the Doctors would write.

This businesse being thus setled, the Ministers departed immediatly, with expectation of some spedie newes frõ the Doctors: from whom as yet they haue hard neither argumẽt nor effect: only they haue hard that throw the citie of *Paris* there hathe bene publike sale of certaine writings, within whose titles is included this word of conference, as to make seeme to the worlde that they contained matter touching the former disputations: this policie was not without great praise to the Printers, so vehemente was the desire of men to knowe the truthe: for whose satisfying and contentment, we thought good to spred abrode the matter as it passed in deede, reseruing till an other time to publish that which the doctors would write against it, if they will write at all, and also the Ministers Answeres, which shall neuer faile.

In the meane while let euery one make his profite of the present Contentes, with prayer to the Father of all lighte to poure more and more the cleare lights of his spirite vpon his Church in the true vnderstanding of his holy words, for the restoring and aduauncement of the spirituall kingdom of Iesus Christe his Sonne our Lorde.

FINIS.

LIBRARY OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.